

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

41c

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud

Book III

Folios 57a-91a



ZEVOCHIM

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH NOTES

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771
www.613etc.com

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Zevachim 57a

And how do we know it of a burnt-offering itself? — Because it is written, At the base of the altar of the burnt-offering:¹ this proves that the statutory burnt-offering requires [sprinkling at] the base.² If so, just as there two applications which constitute four [are required], so here too, two applications which constitute four [are required]?³ —

Said Abaye: Why must ‘round about’ be written in connection with both a burnt-offering and a sin-offering?⁴ That there might be two verses with the same teaching, and two verses with the same teaching do not illumine [other cases].⁵ That is well on the view that they do not illumine; but on the view that they do illumine, what can be said? — The guilt-offering is a third,⁶ and three certainly do not illumine.

THE FIRSTLING IS EATEN BY PRIESTS. Our Rabbis taught, How do we know that a firstling is eaten during two days and one night? Because it is said, And the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave-breast and as the right thigh:⁷ the Writ assimilated it to the breast and the thigh of a peace-offering:⁸ as a peace-offering might be eaten during two days and one night, so may the firstling be eaten during two days and one night. And this question was asked of the Sages in the vineyard of Yabneh:⁹ For how long may a firstling be eaten? Whereupon R. Tarfon replied: During two days and one night. Now a certain disciple was present, who had come to the Beth Hamidrash for the first time, by the name of R. Jose the Galilean. Master, said he to him, whence do you know this? My son, replied he, a peace-offering is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity, and a firstling is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity: as a peace-offering is eaten during two days and one night, so a firstling is eaten during two days and one night. Master, he objected, a firstling is the priest's due, and a sin-offering and a guilt-offering are the priest's dues;¹⁰ [then let us argue,] as a sin-

offering and a guilt-offering [may be eaten] during one day and one night, so a firstling [may be eaten] one day and one night? Said he to him: Let us compare the two objects, and then deduce one from the other:¹¹ as a peace-offering does not come on account of sin, so a firstling does not come on account of sin; [hence,] as a peace-offering is eaten two days and one night, so is a firstling eaten two days and one night. Master, he objected, Let us compare the two objects, and then deduce one from the other: a ¹² sin-offering and a guilt-offering are priestly dues, and a firstling is a priestly due; as ¹² a sin-offering and a guilt-offering cannot be brought as a vow or a freewill-offering,¹³ so a firstling cannot be a vow or a freewill-offering:¹⁴ [hence,] as a sin-offering and a guilt-offering are eaten one day and one night, so may a firstling be eaten one day and one night?

R. Akiba then leaped [into the debate], and R. Tarfon withdrew. Said he [R. Akiba] to him, Behold, it says, ‘And the flesh of them shall be thine [etc.]’: the Writ assimilated them to the breast and thigh of a peace-offering: as a peace-offering is eaten two days and one night, so a firstling is eaten two days and one night. Said he to him: You have likened it to the breast and thigh of a peace-offering, but I might liken it to the breast and thigh of a thanks-offering: as a thanks-offering is eaten one day and one night, so a firstling is eaten one day and one night. Lo, he replied, it says, it shall be thine.¹⁵ Now, ‘it shall be thine’ need not be stated; why then is it said? The Writ thereby prolonged the existence of a firstling.¹⁶ When this discussion was reported to R. Ishmael, he said to them [those who reported it]: Go forth and say to Akiba, You have erred.¹⁷ Whence do we learn this of the thanksoffering?¹⁸ From a peace-offering.¹⁹ Can then that which is learnt through a Hekkesh teach in turn by a hekkesh?²⁰ Hence you must determine it not by the second version but by the first version.²¹ Now, how does R. Ishmael employ this phrase, ‘it shall be thine’?²² — It teaches that a blemished

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

firstling is given to the priest, for which teaching we do not find [any other text] in the whole Torah. And R. Akiba?²³ — He learns it from ‘their flesh’, [which intimates,] whether it whole or blemished. And R. Ishmael?²⁴ — It means, the flesh of these firstlings. Wherein do they differ?²⁵ — One master holds: [That which is inferred] from the subject itself and another does constitute a Hekkesch; while the other master holds: It does not constitute a hekkesh.²⁶ On the view that it does not constitute a Hekkesch, it is well: hence it is written, And so shall he do for the tent of meeting,²⁷ which [intimates]: As he sprinkles the blood of the bullock in the Holy of Holies once upward and seven times downward, so must he sprinkle in the Hekal; and as he sprinkles the blood of the he-goat in the Holy of Holies once upward and seven times downward, so must he sprinkle in the Hekal. But on the view that it does constitute a Hekkesch, what can be said?²⁸ — The localities only are deduced from one another.²⁹

(1) Lev. IV, 7.

(2) For in fact the altar was not used for the burnt-offering exclusively, the very sentence quoted treating of a sin-offering. Hence the verse must mean, at the base of the altar, as is done with a burnt-offering.

(3) Whereas the Mishnah says otherwise.

(4) Burnt-offering, Lev. I, 5: And he shall dash the blood round about against the altar; sin-offering, VIII, 15: And when it was slain, Moses took the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger. ‘Round about’ implies on all four sides. Now, this could be said with reference to a burnt-offering only, and the other would be deduced from it.

(5) Hence the number of applications required by a firstling, etc. cannot be deduced from a burnt-offering.

(6) Where ‘round about’ is said, Lev. VII, 2.

(7) Num. XVIII, 18. The text refers to firstlings.

(8) Since it was the breast and the thigh of a peace-offering which belonged to the priest.

(9) The famous town to the north-west of Jerusalem, seat of R. Johanan b. Zakkai's academy and Sanhedrin after the destruction of the Temple.

(10) Whereas a peace-offering belongs to its owner.

(11) I.e., let us first see to which the firstling is similar, and then learn from it.

(12) The words: ‘a sin-offering... as’ are best omitted with Ms. M.

(13) V. supra 2a, p. 2, n. 6. These sacrifices can be brought only when one has incurred them.

(14) It must actually be a firstling.

(15) Num. XVIII, 18. This reiterates the first half of the verse.

(16) It is correct to liken it to a thanks-offering rather than to a peace-offering, since we cannot permit a longer time for its consumption than the minimum of which we are certain. But the reiteration, ‘it is thine’, implies that it is thine for a longer time than you might otherwise think, and so it is permitted for two days, like a peace-offering.

(17) By likening it to the thanks-offering in the first place.

(18) That its breast and thigh belong to the priest. This is not stated explicitly.

(19) By means of a Hekkesch.

(20) Surely not (v. supra 49b). Hence the thanks-offering in this case cannot throw light on the firstling.

(21) You must compare it in the first instance to a peace-offering, not to a thanks-offering.

(22) Why is it repeated?

(23) Whence does he know this?

(24) How does he explain the plural ‘their’? V. supra 37a, b for notes.

(25) It is a definite rule that what is learnt through a Hekkesch does not teach through a Hekkesch. Why then does R. Akiba adopt this exegesis here?

(26) Now, that a thanks-offering is eaten one day and one night is not inferred by a Hekkesch but stated explicitly, Lev. VII, 15, while that its breast and thigh belong to the priest is inferred by a Hekkesch. R. Ishmael holds that the fact that the priest may eat the breast and the thigh during one day and one night only must be regarded as an inference by a Hekkesch, and therefore it cannot become the basis for another Hekkesch (viz., as to the time permitted for the consumption of a firstling). R. Akiba however maintains that since the time permitted for the thanks-offering is explicitly stated, we do not regard the time allowed for the breast and thigh as the result of a Hekkesch; hence it can become the basis for another Hekkesch.

(27) Lev. XVI, 16.

(28) The passage treats of the ritual of the Day of Atonement. Scripture writes, And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle with his finger upon the ark-cover on the east; and before the ark-cover shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times (ibid. 14). ‘Upon’ and ‘before’ are understood to mean upward and downward respectively: thus, while it is explicitly stated that it is sprinkled seven times downwards, the number of upward sprinklings is not stated, and this is learnt by analogy (Hekkesch) from the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

he-goat, where it says, And sprinkle it (otho) upon the ark-cover, and before the ark-cover (v. 15). There 'it' (otho) is held to indicate one sprinkling, while the number of downward sprinklings is not stated. The present text, and do with his (sc. the he-goat's) blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, teaches that both are sprinkled once upward and seven times downward, since an analogy is drawn between them. Now, each is written partly explicitly and partly inferred by a Hekkesh, and then the same is applied to the Hekal by means of a Hekkesh. Now, if what is inferred partly from the subject itself and partly from another subject does not constitute a Hekkesh, then the sprinklings in the Hekal can rightly be inferred by a Hekkesh from those in the Holy of Holies. But if it does, such inference is disallowed, since what is learnt by a Hekkesh cannot teach by a Hekkesh.

(29) This is not a case of what is learnt by a Hekkesh teaching through a Hekkesh, since the first refers to the animals, whereas the second refers to the localities.

Zevachim 57b

Alternatively, [the sprinklings] without [in the Hekal] are directly inferred from [those] within [the Holy of Holies].¹ On the view that it does not² constitute a Hekkesh, it is well: hence it is written, Ye shall bring out of your dwellings [two] wave-loaves [of two tenth parts of an ephah etc]:³ Now, 'ye shall bring' need not be said;⁴ what then does 'ye shall bring' teach? Whatever you bring on another occasion⁵ must be like this: as here a tenth [of an ephah] is used for hallah, so there⁶ too a tenth is required for hallah. If so, as here two tenths are required, so there too two tenths are required? Therefore Scripture states, they shall be [of fine flour].⁷ We have thus learnt ten [tenths] for leavened [loaves].

Whence do we know ten [tenths] for unleavened loaves? Because it says, With cakes of leavened bread [he shall present his offering with the sacrifice of his peace-offering for thanksgiving]⁸ [which intimates,] Bring an equal quantity of unleavened as of leavened.⁹ But on the view that it constitutes a Hekkesh, what can be said?¹⁰ — 'Ye shall bring' is superfluous.¹¹

THE PASSOVER-OFFERING IS EATEN ONLY [etc]. Which Tanna [rules thus]? — Said R. Joseph, It is R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah. For it was taught, R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said, [And they shall eat the flesh] in the night¹² is stated here, whilst elsewhere it is stated, For I will go through the land of Egypt in that night:¹³ just as there it means by midnight, so here too it means by midnight. Said R. Akiba to him: Yet surely it is already stated, [and ye shall eat it] in haste,¹⁴ [implying] until the time of haste?¹⁵ If so, what is taught by 'in that night'? You might think that it is like all [other] sacrifices, which are eaten by day: therefore it is stated 'in [that] night': it is eaten by night, but it may not be eaten by day. Said Abaye to him [R. Joseph]: How do you know that [the author of our Mishnah is] R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah, while [the law is] Biblical. Perhaps the law is Rabbinical only, [the reason being] to prevent transgression?¹⁶ — If so, why state, ONLY UNTIL MIDNIGHT?¹⁷ But it means, It is as the other laws;¹⁸ as those are Biblical, so is this Biblical.¹⁹

(1) And not via the animals at all.

(2) Emended text (Bah, Sh. M.).

(3) Lev. XXIII, 17.

(4) The text could read: And ye shall present a new offering unto the Lord (v. 16) out of your dwellings, etc.

(5) Lit., 'from another place'.

(6) Lit., 'as there... so here.' The hallah (unleavened loaf) brought on another occasion (v. n. 4) is referred to as 'here', as that is the actual subject being discussed.

(7) Ibid. For the interpretation of this v. Men. 78a top.

(8) Lev. VII, 13.

(9) The preceding verses read: Then he shall offer... unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers spread with oil, and cakes mingled with oil. When this is followed by 'With cakes of leavened bread', etc., it yields a Hekkesh, whence we learn that the weight of the former must be the same as that of the latter.

(10) The wave-loaves brought on Pentecost were made of a tenth of an ephah of flour, and they were leavened. Now, the thanks-offering was accompanied by four kinds of loaves; v. Lev. VII, 12-14. These included a set of leavened loaves (the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

other three kinds were unleavened), but neither the actual number of each kind nor their weight is stated. By means of a *gezerah shawah* the Talmud deduces that there were the loaves of each kind, and from the superfluous 'ye shall bring' it infers that the leavened loaves were each to be made of a tenth of an ephah (these are those brought 'on another occasion'), just like the two wave-loaves, so that ten tenths were required for all. Thus the number is not deduced by a *Hekkesch* but by a *gezerah shawah*, which is regarded as being explicitly stated in the subject itself, while the weight is learned by a *Hekkesch* (the superfluous 'ye shall bring'). Then the Talmud infers by another *Hekkesch* that the weight of the unleavened loaves is the same (v. preceding note). The difficulty then is the same as the preceding on the number of sprinklings (v. p. 287, n. 3).

(11) Hence the fact that the loaves of the thank-offering require a tenth of an ephah each is not regarded as an inference by a *Hekkesch*, but as though it were explicitly stated.

(12) Ex. XII, 8.

(13) Ibid. 12.

(14) Ibid, 11.

(15) I.e., when they had to make haste to leave Egypt, which was in the morning.

(16) Possibly this Tanna holds that by Scriptural law it may be eaten until morning, yet he gives the limit of midnight so as to make sure that one will not transgress by eating it in the morning.

(17) He should state, And it is eaten until midnight.

(18) Lit., 'as there'. Sc. that it may only be eaten roast and by registered persons.

(19) Hence its author must be R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah.

Zevachim 58a

CHAPTER VI

MISHNAH. IF SACRIFICES OF HIGHER SANCTITY ARE SLAUGHTERED ON THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, R. JOSE SAID: [THEY ARE] AS THOUGH THEY WERE SLAUGHTERED IN THE NORTH;¹ R. JOSE SON OF R. JUDAH SAID: FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE ALTAR SOUTHWARD IS AS SOUTH, FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE ALTAR NORTHWARD IS AS THE NORTH.

GEMARA. R. Assi said in R. Johanan's name: R. Jose maintained that the whole of the altar stood in the north.² What then does AS

THOUGH [etc.] mean? You might think that we require [them to be slaughtered] on the side [of the altar].³ which they were not. Hence he informs us [that it is not so]. Said R. Zera to R. Assi: If so, will you indeed say that R. Jose son of R. Judah holds that [the altar] is half in the north and half in the south?⁴ And should you answer, That indeed is so; surely it was you who said in R. Johanan's name: R. Jose son of R. Judah admits that if he slaughtered them in a corresponding position on the ground,⁵ they are unfit? — Said he to him, This is what R. Johanan said: Both of them inferred [their views] from the same text:⁶ And thou shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy peace-offerings:⁷ R. Jose holds: The whole of it [the altar] is fit for [the slaughtering of] the burnt-offering,⁸ and the whole of it is fit for peace-offerings. While R. Jose son of R. Judah holds: Divide it: half of it is for a burnt-offering, and half for a peace-offering. For if you think that the whole of it is fit for a burnt-offering, then seeing that the whole of it is fit for a burnt-offering, need it be said that the whole of it is fit for a peace-offering. And the other?⁹ — It is necessary:¹⁰ You might think that only a burnt-offering [is fit if slaughtered on the top of the altar]. since its room is cramped.¹¹ But as for peace-offerings, whose room is not cramped,¹² I would say that it is not so. Hence [the text] informs us [otherwise]. The [above] text [stated]: 'R. Assi said in R. Johanan's name: R. Jose son of R. Judah admits that if he slaughtered them in a corresponding position on the ground, they are unfit.'

R. Aha of Difti asked Rabina: What does 'in a corresponding position on the ground' mean?¹³ Shall we say, on the cubit of the base or the cubit of the terrace:¹⁴ surely that is the altar itself? Moreover, what does 'on the ground' mean?¹⁵ And if you say that he made a cavity in the ground¹⁶ and slaughtered therein: would that be a [proper altar]? Surely it was taught: An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me:¹⁷ [this teaches] that it must be joined to the earth, that it must not

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

be built over cavities or on rocks? — It means that he shortened it¹⁸

R. Zera said: Is it possible that this statement of R. Johanan¹⁹ is correct, and yet we have not learnt it in the Mishnah?²⁰ So he went out, searched, and found it. For we learnt: They selected from there²¹ sound fig-tree wood²² to arrange the second pile for incense²³ by the south-west horn at a distance of four cubits from it northward; [sufficient wood was taken to make] about five se'ahs of coals,²⁴ and on the Sabbath, about eight se'ahs, because they placed there the two censers of frankincense for the shew-bread.²⁵ And what is the token?²⁶ — This agrees with R. Jose. For it was taught:

- (1) Hence valid.
- (2) Supra 53a.
- (3) Lev. I, 11.
- (4) R. Zera assumed that R. Assi's statement was inferred from the Mishnah: since R. Jose rules that if it is slaughtered anywhere on the top of the altar, it is as though it is slaughtered in the north, it follows that the whole of the altar is in the north. But if this inference is correct, a similar deduction can be made with respect to R. Jose b. R. Judah.
- (5) This will be explained anon.
- (6) I.e., R. Johanan did not base his statement on the Mishnah, but on the Scriptural interpretation of these Rabbis.
- (7) Ex. XX, 21.
- (8) Hence the whole of the altar is in the north, since a burnt-offering must be slaughtered in the north (Lev. I, 11).
- (9) How does he rebut this argument?
- (10) To state that the whole of it is fit for a peace-offering.
- (11) As it must be slaughtered in the north, there may not be enough room when there are many sacrifices; hence Scripture permitted the top of the altar too.
- (12) They can be slaughtered anywhere in the Temple court.
- (13) It cannot mean on the pavement at the side of the altar, for then there would be no difficulty on R. Assi's view. For even if the whole altar stood in the north, yet if one slaughtered on the west or east of it at some distance from the actual side, it would still be unfit, because it must be killed between the north side of the altar and the opposite wall of the Temple court; therefore this could not prove that R. Jose did not hold that half the altar was in the

north and half in the south. Hence it must apparently mean, on the ground of the altar itself. Now, how is this possible?

- (14) The altar' was recessed a cubit for the base and a cubit for the terrace (v. supra 54a).
- (15) The top of the base or the terrace is not 'on the ground'.
- (16) Under the altar.
- (17) Ex. XX, 21.
- (18) It was decided to shorten the altar, and the northern half of it was thus left clear. Although it is still the side, the offerings slaughtered there are unfit, which proves that he holds that the altar is in the south, as there is no other reason for its unfitness.
- (19) That R. Jose holds that the whole altar stood in the north.
- (20) There must be some hint of it in the Mishnah.
- (21) The wood-shed, in which the wood for the altar was kept.
- (22) Not worm-eaten.
- (23) At the side of the large wood-pile, on which the offerings were burnt, a smaller pile was made, whence three kabs of burning coals were taken every morning and evening for the inner altar, on which the incense was burnt.
- (24) So that it should be easy to take the necessary quantity of live coals from it for the inner altar.
- (25) This frankincense was burnt on the Sabbath, and on the outer altar, on this special pile. Therefore more coals were required (as the other incense still had to be burnt on the inner altar). V. Tam. II, 5.
- (26) By which sign did the Sages rule that this second pile was in that particular spot?

Zevachim 58b

R. Jose said: This is the token: whatever is taken [from] within to be placed without,¹ is placed as near as possible [to the inner altar]; and whatever is taken from without to be placed within, is taken from as near as possible [to the inner altar]. 'Whatever is taken [from] within to be placed without': What is it? If we say, the residue [of the blood], surely it is distinctly written thereof, [And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out] at the base of the altar of burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tent of meeting?² Further, as to whatever is taken without to be placed within', what is it? If we say, the coals of the Day of Atonement, surely it is explicitly written thereof, And he shall

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

take a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord?³ Rather, ‘whatever is taken within to be placed without’ means the two censers of the frankincense for the shewbread,⁴ which we infer from the residue [of the blood];⁵ and ‘Whatever is taken without to be placed within’ is the coals of every day,⁶ which are inferred from the coals of the Day of Atonement. Now, what does he hold?⁷ If he holds [that] the whole altar is in the south, he would have to carry it twenty-seven [cubits from the horn]?⁸ And even if he holds that the sanctity of the Hekal and that of the Ulam are one,⁹ yet he would have to carry it down twenty-two cubits?¹⁰ And if he holds that it was half in the north and half in the south, he would have to bring it down eleven cubits?¹¹ And even if he holds that the sanctity of the Hekal and that of the Ulam are one, he would have to bring it down six cubits?¹² Hence it must surely be that he holds that the whole altar was in the north, and these four cubits are as follows: one cubit for the base, one for the terrace, one for the horns, and one for the feet of the priests; for should one go further than this, there would no more be the door.¹³

Said R. Adda b. Ahabah:¹⁴ This is in accordance with R. Judah. For it was taught. R. Judah said: The altar stood in the middle of the Temple court.¹⁵ Now, it was thirty-two cubits [square], [of which] ten cubits faced the door of the Hekal, and [it extended] eleven cubits on either side [thereof]. Thus the altar was exactly opposite the Hekal. Yet even so, according to R. Judah he would have to bring it down eleven cubits? And even if he held that the sanctity of the Hekal and that of the Ulam are one, he would still have to bring it down six cubits? — Do you think that these four cubits include the cubit of the base and the cubit of the terrace? [No:] they are exclusive of the cubit of the base and the cubit of the terrace. Now, let us make this agree with R. Jose, and [assume] that [he too holds that] it

stood in the centre?¹⁶ — Because we know definitely that R. Judah holds that it stood in the middle.¹⁷

R. Sherabia said: This is in accordance with R. Jose the Galilean. For it was taught: R. Jose the Galilean said: Since it says. And thou shalt set the laver between the tent of meeting and the altar,¹⁸ while another verse states, [And thou shalt set]

- (1) From the inner altar on to the outer altar.
- (2) Lev. IV, 7. That is the nearest point to the inner altar. Why then must R. Jose give a general rule for this, when it is explicitly stated?
- (3) Ibid. XVI, 12. ‘Before the Lord’ implies near the inner sanctum.
- (4) They were taken on the Sabbath from the Table, which was within.
- (5) They must be placed (presented) on the side facing the door, which is the nearest point.
- (6) Which are taken from the second pile and placed on the inner altar. R. Jose thus teaches that they are taken from the side facing the door.
- (7) When he states that this second pile is arranged four cubits from the horn northwards.
- (8) The width of the door was ten cubits, five of which were in the north and five in the south, while the altar was thirty-two square. Now, deducting the five cubits which the door passed into the north, the nearest point to the door would thus be twenty-seven cubits from the opposite horn.
- (9) Supra 14a.
- (10) For then, as soon as he reaches a point opposite the door of the Ulam he is ‘before the Lord’. As the door of the Ulam was five cubits wider than that of the Hekal on both sides (i.e., ten wider in all), five cubits can be deducted from the preceding calculation.
- (11) For then there will be sixteen cubits in the south. The figure eleven is arrived at by deducting the five of the door from these sixteen.
- (12) Deducting a further five cubits (cf. n. 5.) from the eleven.
- (13) I.e., it would carry it beyond the line of the door. Thus we have a Mishnah in support of R. Johanan's statement regarding R. Jose.
- (14) To refute this proof.
- (15) I.e., half in the north and half in the south.
- (16) Why insist that the author is R. Judah?
- (17) Whilst we do not know R. Jose's opinion.
- (18) Ex. XL, 7.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Zevachim 59a

the altar of burnt-offering [before the door of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting].¹ [it follows that] the altar was at the door of the tent of meeting, while the laver was not at the door of the tent of meeting. Where then was it [the laver] placed? Between the Ulam and the altar, slightly toward the south. Now what does he hold? If he holds that the whole altar stood in the south, let it be placed southward from the wall of the Hekal, [for that would be] between the Ulam and the altar? And even if he holds that the sanctity of the Ulam and that of the Hekal are one, let it be placed southward from the wall of the Ulam, [for that would still be as] between the Ulam and the altar? Or if he holds that half was in the north and half in the south, let it be placed southward from the wall of the Hekal, between the Ulam and the altar? And even if he holds that the sanctity of the Ulam and that of the Hekal are one, let it be placed southward from the wall of the Ulam, this being between the Ulam and the altar? Hence it must surely be that he² holds that the whole altar stood in the north. Then let it be placed between the altar and the Hekal northward? — He holds that the sanctity of the Hekal and Ulam is identical.³ Then let it be placed northward from the wall of the Ulam, when it would be between the Ulam and the altar? — Scripture saith, northward, which means that the north must be free from vessels.⁴ Which Tanna disagrees with R. Jose the Galilean?⁵ — R. Eleazar b. Jacob. For it was taught: R. Eleazar b. Jacob said: ‘Northward’ [intimates] that the north must be free from everything, even from the altar: Rab said, If the altar was damaged, all sacrifices slaughtered there are unfit. We have a text to this effect, but have forgotten it. When R. Kahana went up,⁶ he found R. Simeon b. Rabbi teaching in R. Ishmael b. R. Jose's name: How do we know that all the sacrifices slaughtered at a damaged altar are unfit? Because it is said, And thou shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-

offerings:⁷ now, do you then sacrifice on it?⁸ Rather, [it means:] when it is whole, and not when it is defective. Said he: That is the text which eluded Rab. But R. Johanan maintained: In both cases they are unfit.⁹ Wherein do they disagree? — Rab holds: Live animals cannot be [permanently] rejected; while R. Johanan holds: Live animals can be [permanently] rejected.¹⁰

An objection is raised. All the sacred animals which were before the altar was built,¹¹ and then the altar was built, are unfit.¹² [Now before] it was built, they were rejected ab initio?¹³ — [Say] rather: before it was razed.¹⁴ ‘[Before] it was razed?’ But they [the animals] would be too old!¹⁵ Rather [it means] [the animals which were consecrated] before the altar was damaged, and then the altar was damaged, are unfit!¹⁶ — Now, did you not emend it? Then read, which were slaughtered.¹⁷ But surely R. Giddal said in Rab's name: If the altar was removed [from its place], the incense was burnt on its [the altar's] site?¹⁸ — Even as Raba said, R. Judah agrees in respect of the blood,¹⁹ so here too. Rab agrees in respect of the blood.²⁰

What [statement of] R. Judah [is referred to]? — It was taught: The same day did the king hallow the middle of the court that was before the house of the Lord... because the brazen altar that was before the Lord was too little to receive the burnt-offering, and the meal-offering and the fat of the peace-offerings:²¹ this is meant literally:²² these are the words of R. Judah. Said R. Jose to him:

(1) Ibid. 6.

(2) R. Jose the Galilean.

(3) So Rashi. The reading varies in different texts, v. Sh. M.

(4) And the laver is a vessel.

(5) Maintaining that the whole of it was in the south.

(6) To Eretz Israel.

(7) Ex. XX, 21.

(8) Surely not. The sacrifice was slaughtered at the side of the altar.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(9) All animals in a state of consecration while the altar was damaged are unfit, whether slaughtered while it was actually damaged, or after it was repaired.

(10) V. supra 12a. When the altar became damaged these animals were rejected, since they could not be sacrificed then. The controversy is whether this rejection is permanent or not.

(11) The altar in the second Temple.

(12) I.e., if they were consecrated before the altar was actually built.

(13) At the very moment that they were consecrated they were unfit, since there was as yet no altar, and in this case there is a view that the animals do not become permanently rejected, v. Kid. 7a.

(14) I.e., the animals consecrated before the altar in the first Temple was destroyed might not be offered when that in the second was built.

(15) By the time that that in the second was built.

(16) Even if slaughtered after it is repaired. This contradicts Rab who declares fit sacrifices offered after the altar had been repaired.

(17) Since you must emend the text in any case, emend it to: all the animals which were slaughtered while the altar was damaged.

(18) This refers to the inner altar, and it is assumed that the same applies to the outer altar. When it is removed it is as damaged, and so Rab is self-contradictory.

(19) The sprinkling of the blood requires an altar.

(20) His ruling applies only to incense, but he agrees that the blood must be sprinkled on a whole altar.

(21) I Kings VIII, 64.

(22) Lit., 'the words are as written'. — I.e., Solomon sanctified the whole of the pavement to serve as an altar, to permit the burning of the limbs, etc., upon it.

Zevachim 59b

But surely it is said, A thousand burnt-offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar,¹ while of the Eternal House² it is said, And Solomon offered for the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which he offered unto the Lord, two and twenty thousand oxen,³ and when you calculate the number of burnt-offerings and the number of cubits, the latter was larger than the former?⁴ Rather, what does 'was too little to receive' mean? As one says to his neighbors. 'So-and-so is a dwarf', when he is

unfit for [sacrificial] service.⁵ But R. Jose says well to R. Judah?⁶ —

R. Judah is consistent with his view, for he maintained that the altar made by Moses was large. For it was taught: [And thou shalt make the altar of acacia wood.] five cubits long, and five cubits broad; [the altar shall be square];⁷ this is meant literally: these are the words of R. Jose. R. Judah said: 'Square' is stated here, and 'square' is stated elsewhere:⁸ as there it was measured from the centre, so here it was measured from the centre. And how do we know [that it was so] there? — Because it is written, And the hearth⁹ shall be twelve cubits long by twelve cubits broad, square. You might think that it was only twelve cubits square; when, however, it says, to¹⁰ the four sides thereof, it teaches that the measurement was taken from the middle.¹¹ And R. Jose?¹² — The gezerah shawah refers to the height [of the altar].

For it was taught: And the height thereof shall be three cubits:¹³ this is meant literally: these are the words of R. Judah. R. Jose said: 'Square' is stated here, and 'square' is stated elsewhere:¹⁴ as there its height was twice its length, so here too [its height was] twice its length.¹⁵ Said R. Judah to him: Is it possible that the priest stood on the altar, performing the service, whilst all the people saw him from without?¹⁶ Said R. Jose to him: But surely it is stated, And the hangings of the court, and the screen for the door of the gate of the court, which is by the tabernacle and by the altar roundabout,¹⁷ [which teaches that] as the tabernacle was ten cubits [high], so was the altar ten cubits [high]; and it says. The hangings for the one side were fifteen cubits.¹⁸

(1) Ibid. III, 4. The altar referred to is the brazen one made in the days of Moses (cf. II Chron. I, 6).

(2) The Temple.

(3) Ibid. VIII, 63.

(4) Moses' altar was five cubits square. From these a cubit must be deducted on all sides for the horns, and a further cubit on all sides for the terrace where the priests walked. This left only one cubit square for the actual burning. Whereas in

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Solomon's altar the actual place for burning was twenty cubits square, according to R. Jose, which means four hundred times as large. If then the smaller altar could cope with a thousand animals, this larger one was surely more than enough for the number offered that day. Hence 'was too little to receive', etc. cannot be meant literally.

(5) I.e., instead of saying directly that for some reason he is unfit, he uses a euphemism and calls him a dwarf. Similarly here, the altar had become unfit for service, and that is delicately stated by saying that it was too small.

(6) His argument is sound. How then does R. Judah rebut it?

(7) Ex. XXVII. 1.

(8) Ezek. XLIII, 16, q.v. It is quoted in the text.

(9) I.e., the actual portion of the altar for burning.

(10) Lit. translation, not in as E.V.

(11) Interpreting 'to' as intimating that from one particular point there were twelve cubits in all directions, hence from the centre. Accordingly, Moses' altar was ten cubits square, not five, and when the two cubits on all sides are deducted (v. n. 11, p. 296) it was still six as against Solomon's twenty cubits square. The latter therefore would not be large enough for the extra work it had to do.

(12) How does he rebut this reasoning?

(13) Ex. *ibid.*

(14) In reference to the golden altar, Ex. XXX, 2: a cubit shall be the length thereof, and a cubit the breadth thereof; square shall it be; and two cubits shall be the height thereof.

(15) Hence, ten cubits.

(16) As would be the case if the altar were ten cubits high; this would not be seemly. — The text is emended in accordance with the Yalkut.

(17) Num. IV, 26.

(18) Ex. XXXVIII, 14. Rashi: it is now understood that they were fifteen cubits in height. Tosaf. objects that the whole context refers to the width, and accordingly emends: 'and the hangings were fifteen cubits,' omitting 'and it says' and 'for one side', this being a statement by R. Jose on their height, not a Biblical quotation.

Zevachim 60a

What then is the meaning of 'And the height five cubits'?¹ From the [upper] edge of the altar to the top [of the hangings]. And what does 'and the height thereof shall be three cubits' mean? From the edge of the terrace to the top [of the altar]. And R. Judah?² — He relates the *gezerah shawah* to the breadth. Now according to R. Judah, surely the priest could be seen? — Granted that the priest

could be seen, the service [sacrifice] in his hand could not be seen. As for R. Judah. it is well: hence it is written, [did the king] hallow.³ But according to R. Jose, what is the meaning of 'did hallow [the middle of the court]?'⁴ — [He hallowed it] to set up the altar therein.⁵ As for R. Jose, it is well: hence it is written, '[was] little'.⁶ But according to R. Judah, what is meant by 'little'?⁷ — This is what it means: The altar of stones which Solomon made instead of the brazen altar was too small. Wherein do they differ?⁸ — One master holds: You learn without from without,⁹ but you do not learn without from within.¹⁰ While the other master holds: You learn a utensil from a utensil, but you do not learn a vessel from an edifice.¹¹

Raba said: R. Judah admits in respect of the blood.¹² For it was taught. R. Judah said: He used to fill a goblet with the mingled blood, so that should the blood of one of them be spilt, it is found that this renders it fit.¹³ But if you think that R. Judah holds that the whole of the Temple court was sanctified,¹⁴ the precept has been already performed.¹⁵ — [No:] perhaps that is because he holds that we require pouring out with man's force?¹⁶ — If so, let us take it and pour it out in its place.¹⁷ [No:] perhaps [that cannot be done] because he holds that the precept must be performed in the most fitting way.¹⁸

R. Eleazar said: If the altar was damaged, you cannot eat the remainder of the meal-offering on account of it, because it is said, And eat it without leaven beside the altar.¹⁹ Now did they eat it then beside the altar?²⁰ Rather [it means]: when it is whole, and not when it is damaged. We have found [it true of] the residue of the meal-offering. How do we know [it of] sacrifices of higher sanctity? — The implication of 'holy' [Kodesh] is learnt by a *gezerah shawah*.²¹ Whence do we know [it of] sacrifices of lesser sanctity? —

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Said Abaye: It is derived by R. Jose's exegesis. For it was taught: R. Jose stated three laws on the authority of

- (1) Ibid. XXVII, 18.
- (2) How does he rebut this?
- (3) He hallowed the pavement to serve as an altar.
- (4) In which respect did he hallow it?
- (5) For this purpose itself the pavement had to be hallowed.
- (6) Not, 'was too little', as E.V. R. Jose understands the verse (I Kings VIII, 64) to mean that Solomon set up an altar of stones, because the brazen altar was unfit, and euphemistically called 'small'.
- (7) Since according to him even the stone altar was not large enough, why state that 'the brazen altar... was too little'?
- (8) Sc. R. Jose who learns the *gezerah shawah* of 'square' from the golden altar, and R. Judah who learns it from Ezekiel.
- (9) The brazen altar and the Temple court were both 'without', i.e., not in the inner sanctum.
- (10) Viz., from the golden altar, which was in the inner sanctum.
- (11) Both the brazen altar and the golden altar were technically utensils, whereas Ezekiel's stone altar was a constructed edifice.
- (12) That the blood could not be sprinkled on the pavement. He sanctified the pavement only in respect of the burning of the fats and the limbs.
- (13) V. supra 34b.
- (14) Even for the sprinkling of the blood.
- (15) The very act of spilling constitutes sprinkling.
- (16) I.e., intentionally done, and not accidentally spilt.
- (17) As soon as the blood is received in a vessel, let it be poured out there and then.
- (18) Which is to sprinkle the blood actually on the altar. Yet possibly, if he did intentionally pour it out on the ground, the rite would be valid.
- (19) Lev. X, 12.
- (20) It might be eaten anywhere in the Temple court.
- (21) Lit., we learn 'holy', 'holy' (Emended text-Sh. M.). — The present text states, for it is most holy, and so the same law is applied to sacrifices of higher sanctity, which are likewise so designated. e.g. Lev. VI. 18.

Zevachim 60b

three elders, and the following is one of them: R. Ishmael said: You might think that a man can take up second tithe¹ to Jerusalem and consume it² there now-a-days.³ and that

would be logical: a firstling must be brought to the 'Place',⁴ and tithe must be brought to the 'Place': as [the law of] firstling operates only whilst the Temple stands, so [the law of] tithe is valid only whilst the Temple stands. [No:] as for a firstling, the reason is because its blood and *emurim* must be presented at the altar!⁵ Let first-fruits prove it.⁶ As for first-fruits, the reason is because they must be placed [before the altar]!⁷ Therefore it states, And thither shall ye bring your burnt-offerings. and your tithes... and the firstlings of your herd and of your flock:⁸ this assimilates tithe to firstling: as [the law of] firstling is valid only whilst the Temple stands, so is tithe valid only whilst the Temple stands. Yet let us revert to the argument and learn it from the common characteristic?⁹ — Because that can be refuted: the feature common to both is that each is connected with the altar.¹⁰ What does he hold?¹¹ If he holds that the first sanctity hallowed it for the nonce and for the future.¹² then even a firstling too [is thus]?¹³ While if he holds that it did not hallow it for the future, there should be a question even about a firstling too? —

Said Rabina: In truth he holds that it did not hallow it [for all time], but here we discuss a firstling whose blood was sprinkled before the Temple was destroyed, then the Temple was destroyed, and we still have its flesh.¹⁴ Now its flesh is likened to its blood:¹⁵ as its blood requires the altar, so does its flesh require the altar.¹⁶ Then tithe comes and is learnt from a firstling.¹⁷ But can then that which is derived by a *Hekkesh* teach in turn by a *Hekkesh*? — The tithe of corn is merely *hullin*. That is well on the view that the taught is the determining factor; but on the view that the teacher is the determining factor, what can be said?¹⁸ — Blood and flesh are the same thing.¹⁹

When Rabin went up,²⁰ he reported this teaching²¹ in R. Jeremiah's presence, whereupon he observed: The Babylonians are fools. Because they dwell in a land of darkness²² they engage in dark discussions.²³

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Have they not heard what was taught: During the dismantling [of the Tabernacle] on their travels,²⁴ sacrifices became unfit,²⁵ and zabin and lepers were sent out of their precincts.²⁶ Whereas another [Baraitha] taught: Sacrifices might be eaten in two places.²⁷ Surely then, the former refers to sacrifices of higher sanctity, and the latter to sacrifices of lesser sanctity?²⁸ —

Said Rabina: Both refer to sacrifices of lesser sanctity, yet there is no difficulty:

- (1) V. p. 246, n. 3.
- (2) Instead of redeeming it.
- (3) I.e., after the destruction of the Temple. — He holds that the sanctity of Eretz Israel was not annulled thereby, and so one must still set aside tithes.
- (4) The 'Place' par excellence — Jerusalem.
- (5) Hence the law does not operate without a Temple and altar. But that would not apply to tithes.
- (6) Which were brought only whilst the Temple stood, as it says, And he shall set it down before the altar of the Lord thy God (Deut. XXVI, 4) which implies that there must be an altar, though there was no blood or emurim to be presented thereat
- (7) Hence at this stage there are no grounds for supposing that the law of tithe is valid only when the Temple is standing.
- (8) Deut. XII, 6.
- (9) Why is the foregoing Hekkesch necessary? Though it cannot be learnt from either firstling or first-fruits, it could be learnt from their common feature, which is that both must be brought to Jerusalem and both are in force only as long as the Temple stands. Hence the same applies to second tithe, which shows this feature.
- (10) The blood and emurim of a firstling must be presented at the altar, and first-fruits must be placed before the altar. But tithe is not connected with the altar in any way.
- (11) When he assumes that the law is certain and obvious in respect of firstling, but not in respect of tithes.
- (12) I.e., that the sanctity of the Temple was for all time, even after its destruction.
- (13) Rashi: even a firstling should be brought to Jerusalem and eaten there, for on the view that its sanctity was for all time it was to be offered even after the Temple's destruction.
- (14) Which no longer needs the altar; nevertheless it may not be eaten.

(15) Num. XVIII, 17f: Thou shalt dash their blood against the altar, and shalt make their fat smoke for an offering made by fire...and the flesh of them shall be thine. These, being written together, are assimilated to one another.

(16) In the sense that it may not be eaten when there is no longer an altar.

(17) That the same applies to it.

(18) For notes v. supra 45a.

(19) They are both parts of the same offering. Hence, when we say that the flesh requires the altar, just as the blood, this is not regarded as the result of a Hekkesch, but as though the Biblical teaching concerning the blood naturally refers to the flesh too.

(20) To Palestine. Rabin and R. Dimi were two Rabbis who travelled backwards and forwards between Palestine and Babylon, acting as intellectual links between the academies of both.

(21) Viz., Abaye's statement that sacrifices become unfit through the altar being damaged, and its inference by R. Jose's exegesis.

(22) Babylonia is possibly so called on account of the Parsees (fire-worshippers), who forbade the Jews to have any light in their dwellings on their (the Parsees') festivals.

(23) They discuss laws without knowing their true meaning or derive them incorrectly.

(24) When the Tabernacle was dismantled and taken apart, which was when the Israelites were actually travelling.

(25) The flesh of sacrifices of higher sanctity might not be eaten, even if their blood had been sprinkled before the dismantling.

(26) The precincts which were permitted to them whilst the Israelites were encamped. Thus zabin were sent out of the Levitical camp, and lepers out of the camp of the Israelites (v. p. 276. n. 6).

(27) (i) Within their normally permitted boundaries, when the Tabernacle was up; and (ii) in any place, when they were actually travelling. This contradicts the former teaching.

(28) The latter may be eaten even when the Tabernacle is dismantled. At that time there would be no altar either, and that is certainly no better than when the altar stands but is damaged. This proves that sacrifices of lesser sanctity may be eaten when the altar is damaged, and thus contradicts Abaye. Therefore R. Jeremiah called Abaye's teaching 'dark', i.e., incorrect.

Zevachim 61a

The former agrees with R. Ishmael,¹ the latter with the Rabbis.² Alternatively, both treat of sacrifices of higher sanctity; but what does 'in

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

two places' mean? Before the Levites set up the Tabernacle

- (1) Who assimilates the flesh to the blood; hence it may not be eaten.
- (2) Who do not assimilate the flesh to the blood.

Zevachim 61b

and after the Levites dismantled the Tabernacle.¹ You might argue that [in the latter case the flesh] became unfit through having gone out [of bounds].² Therefore he informs us [otherwise]. Yet say that that is indeed so? — Scripture saith, Then the tent of meeting shall set forward:³ even when it has set forward⁴ it is 'the tent of meeting.'⁵

R. Hisda⁶ said in Rab's name: The altar at Shiloh was of stones. For it was taught, R. Eleazar b. Jacob said: Why is 'stones' stated three times?⁷ One refers to that of Shiloh, another to that of Nob and Gibeon, and the third to that of the Eternal House.⁸ R. Aha b. Ammi raised an objection: The fire which descended from heaven in the days of Moses did not depart from the brazen altar until the days of Solomon.¹⁰ And the fire which descended in the days of Solomon¹¹ did not depart until Manasseh came and removed it. Now if this is correct,¹² it should have departed earlier?¹³ — He [R. Hisda in Rab's name] made his statement in accordance with R. Nathan. For it was taught, R. Nathan said: The altar at Shiloh was of brass; it was hollow, and filled with stones.¹⁴

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: What does 'it did not depart' mean? It did not depart [disappear] into nothingness.¹⁵ How was it? — The Rabbis said: It sent forth sparks.¹⁶ R. Papa said: It took up its abode now here, now there. We learnt elsewhere: And when the Children of the Exile went up [to Eretz Israel],¹⁷ they added thereto¹⁸ four cubits on the south and four cubits on the west, like a [Greek] gamma.¹⁹ What is the reason? — Said R. Joseph: Because it [the first] was not sufficient. Said Abaye to him: If it was

sufficient for the first Temple, when it is written, Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea [shore] in multitude;²⁰ would it be insufficient for the second Temple. whereof it is written, The whole congregation together was forty and two thousand [etc.]?²¹ — There [in the first Temple] the heavenly fire assisted them;²² here [in the second Temple] it did not assist them.

When Rabin came [from Palestine], he said in the name of R. Simeon b. Pazzi: They added the pits [to its structure].²³ At first they had thought that an 'altar of earth' meant that it was to be closed in with earth.²⁴ But subsequently they held that drinking must be like eating.²⁵ and what does 'an altar of earth' mean? that it should be attached to the earth, not built on rocks

(1) 'Before the Levites set up the Tabernacle' cannot be understood literally, but means whilst the Tabernacle was standing, this phrase merely being used in contrast to the second half. Thus the two places are: (i) within the normal precincts of the Tabernacle (within the 'hangings' — v. p. 266, n. 6) whilst it stood; and (ii) likewise within the normal precincts, but after the Tabernacle had been dismantled. The altar, however, was still standing.

(2) I.e. when the Tabernacle is dismantled, and the hangings are no longer there, the flesh should be regarded as having gone out of bounds, and so disqualified.

(3) Num. II, 17.

(4) Hence dismantled.

(5) It still retains its sanctity, in the sense that the flesh is not regarded as having gone out of bounds.

(6) Emended text (Sh. M). Cur. edd. Huna.

(7) Ex. XX, 22: And if thou make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones; Deut XXVII, 5-6: And there shalt thou build... an altar of stones... Thou shalt build the altar of the Lord thy God of unhewn stones.

(8) The Temple at Jerusalem.

(9) V. Lev. IX, 24.

(10) Rashi: A pot was placed over it when they travelled, and the fire remained in its place. When Solomon built the Temple, this fire left the brazen altar and moved to the stone altar in the Temple.

(11) This same fire.

(12) That the altar at Shiloh was of stone.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(13) As soon as the stone altar was built at Shiloh, the fire should have departed from Moses' brazen altar.

(14) The answer is not clear. Presumably it means that it was Moses' brazen altar except that the hollow was filled with stones instead of earth.

(15) Lit., 'in vain,' 'for no purpose.' Until Solomon built the Temple the fire did not completely depart from Moses' altar which was still in existence, for though it did move to the altar at Shiloh, some of it nevertheless remained on that of Moses.

(16) When the fat, etc., was burnt on the stone altar, sparks and flames shot out from the heavenly fire on the brazen altar, which was there too, on to the stone altar.

(17) I.e., when the Jews returned from Babylon.

(18) To the altar.

(19) The altar in the first Temple was twenty-eight cubits square overall, whilst that of the second Temple was thirty-two cubits. The addition would thus be a strip four cubits broad in triangular shape, like a Greek gamma thus:

(20) I Kings IV, 20. The bracketed word 'shore', not in the M.T., is found in some old Hebrew MSS.

(21) Ezra II, 64.

(22) To burn the sacrifices quickly.

(23) In Solomon's Temple there was a pit near the south-west of the altar, into which the altar libations were directly poured. But in the second Temple the altar was extended on the south and the west, so that the place of the pit was incorporated in it, and over against this extension on top of the altar they made holes for the libations to flow' into the pit below.

(24) Not hollow or perforated in any way.

(25) As 'eating' (the consumption of the flesh) was on top of the altar itself, so must 'drinking' (the libations) be on top of the altar itself.

sixty cubits [in length], so were there sixty cubits for the altar.⁷ As for the Temple, it is well, for its outline was distinguishable;⁸ but how did they know [the site of] the altar? —

Said R. Eleazar: They saw [in a vision] the altar built, and Michael the great prince standing and offering upon it. While R. Isaac Nappaha⁹ said: They saw Isaac's ashes lying in that place.¹⁰ R. Samuel b. Nahman said: From [the site of] the whole House they smelt the odor of incense, while from there [the site of the altar] they smelt the odor of limbs.

Rabbah b. Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: Three prophets¹¹ went up with them from the Exile: one testified to them about [the dimensions of] the altar; another testified to them about the site of the altar; and the third testified to them that they could sacrifice even though there was no Temple.¹² In a Baraita it was taught, R. Eleazar b. Jacob said: Three prophets went up with them from the Exile: one who testified to them about [the dimensions of] the altar and the site of the altar; another who testified to them that they could sacrifice even though there was no Temple; and a third who testified to them that the Torah should be written in Assyrian characters.¹³

Our Rabbis taught: The horn, the ascent, the base and squareness are indispensable; the measurements of its length, breadth and height are not indispensable. How do we know it? — Said R. Huna, Scripture saith, 'The altar', and wherever 'the altar' is said it is indispensable.¹⁴ If so, are the laver, according to Rabbi, and the terrace, according to R. Jose son of R. Judah, also indispensable, because it is written, And thou shalt put it under the karkob [ledge] round the altar beneath,¹⁵ and it was taught: What was the karkob? Rabbi said: It was the laver; R. Jose son of R. Judah said: It was the terrace!¹⁶ —

Yes [it is indeed so], for it was taught: On that day¹⁷ the horn of the altar was damaged, and

Zevachim 62a

or over cellars.¹

R. Joseph said: Is that not which was taught: And they set the altar upon its bases,² [which means] that they attained to its final measurements?³ But surely it is written, And all this [do I give thee] in writing, as the Lord hath made me wise by His hand upon me, even all works of this pattern?⁴ Rather said R. Joseph: They found a text and interpreted it:⁵ Then David said: This is the house of the Lord God, and this is the altar of burnt-offering for Israel:⁶ [this intimated that the altar was] like the house: as the house was

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

they brought a lump of salt and stopped it up. Not because it was [now] fit for service, but that it should not appear damaged, for every altar which lacks¹⁸ a horn, ascent, base and squareness is invalid. R. Jose son of R. Judah said: The same applies to the terrace.

Our Rabbis taught: What was the karkob? [A strip] between one horn and another horn a cubit [in breadth], where the priests walked. Did then the priests walk between one horn and another? — Rather say: and there was [a strip of] a cubit where the priests walked.¹⁹ But it is written, Under the karkob round it beneath, reaching halfway up!²⁰ — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: There were two, one for ornamental purposes, and the other for the priests, that they should not slip.²¹ ‘The measurements of its length, breadth, and height are not indispensable.’ Said R. Mani: provided that it is not smaller than the altar made by Moses. And how much is that? — Said R. Joseph: One cubit [square]. They ridiculed him: [quoting the text, And thou shalt make the altar...] five cubits long, and five cubits broad!²² Said Abaye to him: perhaps the master meant the place of the pile?²³ — The master [sc. yourself], who is a great man, knows what I meant, he replied. Then he dubbed them²⁴

(1) But that did not exclude the possibility of its being hollow.

(2) Ezra III, 3.

(3) R. Joseph had once fallen sick, and on his recovery it was found that he had forgotten many of his earlier teachings and traditions. Here he states that his assertion that because the heavenly fire helped them a larger altar was unnecessary was incorrect, the real reason being as he proceeds to explain. — ‘They attained its final measurements’ means that it was revealed to the builders of the second altar (the ‘Men of the Great Assembly’) exactly which site was sacred for the altar, this knowledge having been withheld from Solomon when he built the first altar.

(4) I Chron. XXVIII, 19. ‘All this’ refers to the plans of the first Temple with all its appurtenances. Thus it had all been divinely revealed to Solomon too, which contradicts the former statement.

(5) The Men of the Great Assembly were guided by a text in their decision to enlarge the altar.

(6) Ibid. XXII, 1.

(7) An area of sixty cubits square was sacred for the altar, and they might build it anywhere within that. Nevertheless, they did not need it so large, and therefore they enlarged it merely according to their requirements.

(8) They could easily ascertain, from a study of the ruins, what had been sanctified for each part of the Temple.

(9) Or, the smith.

(10) According to legend Isaac was bound, and the substitute ram sacrificed, on the very site of the altar, and the ashes were still there.

(11) Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

(12) Because the sanctity of the Temple had hallowed the spot for all time.

(13) I.e., the square form of Hebrew now in use. V. Sanh. (Sonc. ed.) p. 119. notes.

(14) The def. art. implies that only when it is exactly as specified (in the place where the def. art. is used) is it an altar. The horns: the horns of the altar (Lev. IV, 18); the base: the base of the altar (ibid. 30); squareness: the altar shall be four square (Ex. XXVII, 1); the ascent: in front of the altar (Lev. VI, 7) ‘in front’ being the ascent to the altar.

(15) Ex. XXVII, 5.

(16) Thus ‘the altar’ is written in connection with these.

(17) When ‘a certain man’ poured out the water of libation over his feet; v. Suk. 48b.

(18) This includes the case where they are damaged.

(19) There was a kind of trench between the ma'arakah, i.e., the place on the altar where the sacrifices, etc. were burnt, and the edge of the altar. This trench was two cubits wide, including one cubit between the horns and one cubit where the priests walked (Rashi, as emended by Sh. M.).

(20) Ibid. XXXVIII, 4. Scripture states that the network grating around the sides of the altar was under the karkob. This implies that the karkob was on the wall of the altar; for if it was on the top surface, a grating on the sides could not be described as under it.

(21) There was an ornamental ledge on the side of the altar, and a trench on the top, to provide a firm foothold for the priests.

(22) Ex. XXVII, 1.

(23) Where the sacrifice was burnt. For of the five cubits two cubits had to be deducted on all sides for the strip between the horns and the pathway for the priests, leaving an area of one cubit square for the place of the pile.

(24) Who had ridiculed him.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Zevachim 62b

‘the children of Keturah’.¹

The sons of R. Tarfon's sister were sitting before R. Tarfon.² Thereupon he quoted: And Abraham took another wife, and her name was Johani.³ Said they to him: ‘Keturah’ is written. Then he dubbed them ‘the children of Keturah’.⁴

R. Abin⁵ b. Huna said in R. Hama b. Guria's name: The logs which Moses made⁶ were a cubit long and a cubit broad, and their thickness was that of the instrument for leveling off the top of a se'ah.⁷ R. Jeremiah observed: [It was measured] with a stumped cubit.⁸ Said R. Joseph: Is not that which was taught: Upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar:⁹ [this intimates] that the wood must not project at all beyond the altar?¹⁰

We learnt elsewhere: There was an ascent at the south [side] of the altar, thirty-two [cubits] in length by sixteen cubits in breadth. Whence do we know it?¹¹ — Said R. Huna: Scripture saith, And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward;¹² [this intimates] that the side must be in the north and the front in the south.¹³ Yet say: the side in the north and the face in the north?¹⁴ —

Said Raba: Throw a man on his face.¹⁵ Said Abaye to him: On the contrary, let the man sit upright? — It is written, [The altar shall be] rabua'.¹⁶ But surely that is required [to teach] that it must be square? — Is then meruba' written?¹⁷ And on your reasoning, is then rabuz written?¹⁸ Rather, rabua' is written, which implies both,¹⁹

Now, a Tanna infers it from the following. For it was taught. R. Judah said: And the steps thereof shall look toward the east:²⁰ every turning which you take must be rightward to the east.²¹ Yet say: must be leftward to the east?²² — You cannot think so.

For Rami b. Ezekiel recited: The sea which Solomon made ‘stood upon twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, and three looking toward the west, and three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east:²³ [this teaches that] every turning which you take must be to the right, eastward.²⁴ But that is required for its own purpose²⁵ — If so, why must ‘looking toward’ be repeated?²⁶

R. Simeon b. Jose b. Lakunia asked R. Jose: Did R. Simeon b. Yohai maintain that there was a space between the ascent and the altar?²⁷ — And do you not maintain so? he replied. Surely it is said, And thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood:²⁸ [this intimates that] just as the blood requires throwing,²⁹ so does the flesh require throwing?³⁰ I assert that he stood at the side of the place of the pile and threw it, he answered.³¹ Said he to him: When he threw, did he throw on to a burning pile or on to a pile that was not burning? Surely on to a burning pile, and there it would be impossible [to do otherwise].³² R. Papa said: [It must be] like the blood. Just as [in the case of the] blood, the air-space above the pavement interposed, so [in the case of the] flesh, the air-space above the pavement interposed.³³

Rab Judah said: Two small stairways branched off from the [major] ascent, by which one turned to the base and to the terrace. and these were separated from the altar by a hairsbreadth, because ‘round about’ is said.³⁴ Whilst R. Abbahu quoted rabua'[foursquare].³⁵ Now, both ‘round about’ and ‘rabua’ must be written. For if the Divine Law wrote ‘round about’ [only], I would say that it can be circular; therefore the Divine Law wrote rabua'. Whilst if the Divine Law wrote rabua' [only], I would say that it could be long and narrow;³⁶ hence the Divine Law wrote ‘round about’.³⁷ We learnt elsewhere: The ascent and the altar were sixty-two [cubits]. But they were sixty four?³⁸ — Hence it is found that it overhung a cubit of the base and a cubit of the balcony.³⁹

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

- (1) Gen. XXV, 4. You are indeed Abraham's descendants, but not his true Jewish descendants through Isaac and Jacob.
- (2) In silence. So he misquoted a verse in order to evoke a comment.
- (3) Ibid. I. The last word of course is wrong.
- (4) Rashi: ignoramuses, who could not discuss halachah.
- (5) Emended text (Sh. M.). Cur, edd. Abaye.
- (6) Two logs were placed on the altar fire pile for the morning Tamid (q.v. Glos.) and the evening Tamid; v. Yoma 26b.
- (7) A se'ah was a measure. In buying and selling corn this measure was filled, and the top or pile was leveled down by a stick, called a 'strike'. — Sh. M. observes that as the place of the pile itself on Moses' altar was only one cubit square, these logs must have been stood endways upon it, with wood chips between to assist the fire to catch on.
- (8) I.e., rather shorter than a cubit. 'Aruch reads gerumah instead of gedumah, which reverses the meaning: with a generous cubit, i.e., slightly more than a cubit. This makes the difficulty that follows more plausible.
- (9) Lev. I, 8.
- (10) I.e. beyond the place of the pile. Rashi: why then must it be a stumped cubit; it could be exactly a cubit? Tosaf. And Sh. M.: how then can it be a 'generous' cubit? — The objection remains unanswered.
- (11) That it had to be on the south side.
- (12) Ibid. 11.
- (13) Yerek, translated 'side' literally means 'thigh', hence the legs. Thus the altar must be like a man lying with his legs stretched northward and his face in the south. The side of the altar having this ascent would naturally be the front.
- (14) Like a man sitting upright.
- (15) It must be like a man lying face downward—hence the face in the opposite direction to the legs.
- (16) E.V. 'foursquare'. Ex. XXVII, 1. He connects rabua' with Raba', to lie down, and interprets: the altar shall be like a man lying down.
- (17) Which definitely means square and nothing else.
- (18) Which equally means lying down and nothing else.
- (19) Square and lying down.
- (20) Ezek. XLIII, 17.
- (21) The text refers to the altar, and is interpreted to mean that the altar must be so constructed that when the priest, standing by the altar, has to turn round the side, he will turn right, and go eastward. That is possible only if the ascent is at the south.
- (22) Which would necessitate the ascent on the north.
- (23) II. Chron. IV, 4.

- (24) Since the order here is first north and then west, and when a man is facing the north, he must turn right in order to go to the west.
- (25) To describe the position of the oxen.
- (26) In each case. The word literally means 'turning toward', and the repetition is interpreted as in the text.
- (27) The ascent did not come right up to the altar, but left a gap between.
- (28) Deut. XII, 27.
- (29) I.e., dashing against the altar.
- (30) On to the altar. Consequently, a priest standing at the top of the ascent could not place the flesh on the altar, but had to throw it, which implies that there was a gap.
- (31) This would not necessitate a gap.
- (32) Since the wood was burning, the priest obviously could not go right up to it, but had to stand at a distance and throw it. But in that case, since it was impossible to do otherwise, no text would be required. Hence the text must teach that there was a gap between the ascent and the altar, not that there was one between the priest and the pile.
- (33) Which would not be the case if he stood at the side of the pile.
- (34) Which implies that it must be possible to encompass the altar itself, even if only by drawing a thread about it. But if the ascent actually joined the altar, this could not be done.
- (35) Which likewise implies that the altar stood, unattached, as a square edifice.
- (36) I.e., I could translate rabua' = rectangular, but not necessarily square.
- (37) Implying that all its sides must be equal.
- (38) Since each was thirty-two.
- (39) Cf. supra 54a.

Zevachim 63a

Rami b. Hama said: All the ascents had a gradient of one cubit in three,¹ except the ascent of the altar, which [rose one cubit] in three and a half cubits and a finger and a third, counting the little fingers.²

MISHNAH. THE FISTFULS OF MEAL-OFFERINGS WERE TAKEN IN ANY PART OF THE TEMPLE COURT, AND THEY [THE MEAL-OFFERINGS] WERE EATEN WITHIN THE HANGINGS, BY MALE PRIESTS, PREPARED IN ANY MANNER, ON THE SAME DAY AND NIGHT, UNTIL MIDNIGHT.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said: If the fistful of a meal-offering was taken in the Hekal, it [the ceremony] is valid, for thus we find it in the removal of the censers.³ R. Jeremiah raised an objection: And he shall take thence⁴ [his fistful]:⁵ [that means] from the place where the feet of the Zar stand.⁶

Ben Bathyra said: How do we know that if [the priest] took the fistful with his left [hand], he must return [the fistful] and take it with his right [hand]? Because it says, 'thence', [which means,] from the place whence he had already taken a fistful?⁷ Some state that he [R. Jeremiah] raised the objection, and answered it himself; others state. R. Jacobs⁸ answered R. Jeremiah: Bar Tahlifa has explained it: Its purpose is only to declare the whole of the Temple court fit.⁹ I might argue: Since a burnt-offering is a most holy sacrifice, and a meal-offering is most holy: as a burnt-offering requires the north, so does a meal-offering require the north. [Therefore the text informs us otherwise.] As for a burnt-offering, the reason is because it is altogether burnt?¹⁰ —

[Then learn it] from a sin-offering.¹¹ As for a sin-offering, the reason is because it atones for those who are liable to kareth? — [Then learn it] from a guilt-offering. As for a guilt-offering, the reason is because it is a blood sacrifice. And as for all these too, the reason is because they are blood sacrifices?¹² —

Rather, [the text] is necessary. I might think, since it is written, And he shall bring it unto the altar...¹³ and he shall take up therefrom his fistful:¹⁴ as it must be brought near to the south-west horn,¹⁵ so must the fistful be taken by the south-west horn. Hence [the text] informs us [that it is not so].

R. Johanan said: If a peace-offering is slaughtered in the Hekal, it is fit, because it is said, And he shall kill it at the door of the tent of meeting,¹⁶ and the adjunct cannot be stricter than the principal.¹⁷

An objection is raised: R. Johanan b. Bathyra said: How do we know that if heathens surrounded the whole of the Temple court,¹⁸ the priests enter the Hekal and eat there the most holy sacrifices and the remainder of the meal-offering?¹⁹ Because it says, In a most holy place²⁰ shalt thou eat thereof.²¹ Yet why [is this text necessary]? Let us quote, In the court of the tent of meeting shall they eat it,²² and the adjunct cannot be stricter than the principal?²³ — How compare: there [that we are dealing with] service, we say, Let the adjunct not be stricter than the principal, since a man can perform a service in the presence of his master. [But as for] eating, since a man cannot eat in the presence of his master.²⁴ we do not say, Let the adjunct not be stricter than the principal.

MISHNAH. THE SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD WAS SACRIFICED²⁵ BY THE SOUTH-WEST HORN. NOW, IT WAS FIT [IF DONE] IN ANY PLACE, BUT THIS WAS ITS [PARTICULAR] PLACE.²⁶ THAT HORN SERVED FOR THREE THINGS BELOW, AND THREE THINGS ABOVE.²⁷ BELOW: FOR THE SIN-OFFERING OF THE BIRD, FOR THE PRESENTING [OF MEAL-OFFERINGS].²⁸ AND FOR THE RESIDUE OF THE BLOOD.²⁹ ABOVE: FOR THE POURING OUT OF WINE AND WATER, AND FOR THE BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD WHEN THE EAST WAS TOO MUCH OCCUPIED.³⁰ ALL WHO ASCENDED THE ALTAR ASCENDED BY THE RIGHT,

(1) They rose one cubit in every three.

(2) Of which six go to a tefah (handbreadth). — As heavy limbs of animals had to be carried up on it, it had an easier gradient, nine cubits in thirty-two, which works out as in the text. (The translation adopts the marginal reading.)

(3) Twelve loaves, called Showbread, were placed on the Table in the Hekal, accompanied by censers of frankincense (v. Lev. XXIV, 5 seq.). When the censers were removed (a week after they were placed there), the Showbread might be eaten by the priests. Thus the removing of the censers corresponded to the taking of the fistful, which likewise rendered the rest permitted; hence, as the former was done in the Hekal, so was the latter valid if done in the Hekal.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(4) E.V. there-out, but the Talmud understands the word to bear a local meaning.

(5) Lev. II, 2.

(6) The verse commences: And he (sc. the Zar) shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests; and continues, And he (sc. The priest) shall take thence, etc. Hence 'thence' is interpreted, from the place where the Zar is standing. This is now assumed to exclude the Ulam and the Hekal, where a Zar might not enter.

(7) Thus it intimates that it is sometimes necessary to take the fistful twice, which is only possible in this case.

(8) Marginal emendation.

(9) 'From the place where the feet of the Zar stand' teaches that the whole of the Temple court is fit for the ceremony, and all the more the Hekal and the court of the priests, seeing that this was a priestly ceremony.

(10) But a meal-offering is not, and so there is no reason for supposing that it requires the north. What then is the need for a text to teach that it does not?

(11) Which is not altogether burnt, and yet requires the north.

(12) I.e., this reason would suffice apart from the others already stated.

(13) Lev. II, 8.

(14) Ibid. VI, 8.

(15) As is deduced infra.

(16) Ibid. III, 2.

(17) Since it must be killed at the door of the tent of meeting, the tent of meeting (corresponding to the Hekal) is obviously the principal place for it, while the Temple court is but an adjunct thereto.

(18) Shooting arrows and hurling missiles into it.

(19) Emended text (Sh. M.).

(20) Implying the Hekal.

(21) Num. XVIII, 10.

(22) Lev. VI, 9.

(23) By the same argument as above: the 'court' is an adjunct to the 'tent of meeting' (the Hekal); if it can be eaten in the former place, it can surely be eaten in the latter.

(24) Eating is for one's own benefit, and it may therefore be disrespectful to do it in the master's (here, God's) presence. — The Hekal, being more sacred than the Temple court, is referred to as 'in the Master's presence'.

(25) Lit., 'made', The Mishnah does not say 'slaughtered', as it was not slaughtered but had its neck wrung.

(26) The Gemara discusses what this means,

(27) 'Below' and 'above' refer to the scarlet line which encompassed the altar.

(28) Before their fistfuls were taken they were presented ('brought near') at this horn.

(29) Of the outer sin-offerings. These were sprinkled there.

(30) Its proper place was at the south-east horn, but if many animal burnt-offerings were being sacrificed there, this was offered at the south-west horn, above the line.

Zevachim 63b

THEN THEY WENT ROUND [THE ALTAR]¹ AND DESCENDED BY THE LEFT, EXCEPT FOR THESE THREE, WHO ASCENDED AND DESCENDED BY RETRACING THEIR STEPS.²

GEMARA. Whence do we know it? — Said R. Joshua, Scripture saith: He shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon, for it is a sin-offering;³ a sin-offering is designated a meal-offering,⁴ and a meal-offering is designated a sin-offering: as a sin-offering requires the north, so does a meal-offering require the north;⁵ and as a meal-offering [is presented] at the south-west horn, so is a [bird] sin-offering [offered] at the south-west horn.⁶ And how do we know this of the meal-offering itself? —

Because it was taught: [The sons of Aaron shall offer it] before the Lord;⁷ You might think, at the west [of the altar];⁸ therefore it states, in front of the altar.⁹ If [it is to be] 'in front of the altar', you might think, in the south; but Scripture says, 'before the Lord'. How then was it done? He presented it at the south-west horn, opposite the edge of the horn, and that is sufficient. R. Eleazar said: You might think that he presents it on the west of the horn or the south of the horn; but you can rebut [this], [for] wherever you find two texts, one confirming itself and the other, whereas the second confirms itself but annuls the other, you abandon the one which confirms itself and annuls the other, and accept that which confirms itself and the other too. Thus, if you say 'before the Lord' [means] in the west, how can you confirm 'in front of the altar'? But when you say, 'in front of the altar', means in the south, you confirm before the Lord as meaning the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

south¹⁰ But how can you confirm this? — Said R. Ashi: This Tanna holds that the whole altar stood in the north.¹¹

NOW. IT WAS FIT [IF DONE] IN ANY PLACE, etc. What does this mean?¹² — Said R. Ashi, This is what it means: Any place is fit for its melikah, but this was the place for its sprinkling. We have thus learnt here what our Rabbis taught: If he nipped it by any part of the altar, it is valid; if he sprinkled its blood on any part [of the altar], it is valid. (If he sprinkled [the blood] but did not drain it out, it is valid)¹³ provided that he applies some of the life blood¹⁴ below the scarlet line. What does this mean?¹⁵ — This is what he means: If he nipped it by any part of the altar, it is valid; if he drained the blood at any part of the altar, it is valid,

(1) For whatever they had to do, e.g., sprinkle the blood or arrange the wood pile.

(2) By the left. V. Suk. 48b.

(3) I.e., they returned the same way as they came.

(10) Lev. V, 11. This refers to a sinner's meal-offering brought in extreme poverty instead of a bird sin-offering.

(4) Since the latter can be a substitute for it.

(5) Rashi maintains that the text is faulty, because a bird sin-offering did not require the north, nor did a sinner's meal-offering. He conjectures as an emendation: as a (bird) sin-offering is invalid if offered under a different designation, so is a (sinner's) meal-offering invalid in similar circumstances. R. Hayyim in Tosaf. emends: as the blood of a bird sin-offering must be poured out at the base, so must a sinner's meal-offering be presented at the base.

(6) I.e., its blood is sprinkled there.

(7) Lev. VI, 7. This refers to a meal-offering, and 'before the Lord' means at the altar.

(8) Which faced the Hekal, and so might appropriately be described as 'before the Lord'.

(9) Ibid. 'Front' is the south, where the ascent ran.

(10) For variant reading v. Men. 19b.

(11) Hence the south of the altar ended opposite the door leading to the Hekal, and so that too would be called 'before the Lord'.

(12) It cannot be meant as it stands, for if it was fit in any place, why insist on a particular spot?

(13) Sh. M. deletes the bracketed passage.

(14) The first blood which gushes forth.

(15) This is apparently self-contradictory, as the first states that it is valid if sprinkled anywhere,

and then states that it must be sprinkled below the scarlet line.

Zevachim 64a

for if he sprinkled but did not drain out, it is valid,¹ provided that he applies some of the life blood below the scarlet line.

[THAT HORN SERVED FOR] THREE THINGS, etc. FOR THE SIN-OFFERING OF THE BIRD, as we have stated.² FOR THE PRESENTING: for it is written, And he shall bring it near [i.e., present it] unto the altar.³

FOR THE RESIDUE OF THE BLOOD: for it is written, And all the remaining blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar.⁴

ABOVE: FOR THE POURING OF THE WINE AND THE WATER, AND FOR THE BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD WHEN THE EAST WAS TOO MUCH OCCUPIED.

What is the reason?⁵ — R. Johanan said: Because it is nearest to the ash deposit.⁶ R. Johanan said: Come and see

how great was the strength of the priests, for no part of birds is lighter than the crop and the feathers, yet sometimes the priest threw them more than thirty cubits.⁷ For we learnt: He took a silver pan [brazier] and ascended to the top of the altar, where he parted the coals to either side, [and] shoveled out some of the inner burnt coals; then he descended and reached the pavement. He turned his face toward the north, proceeded to the east of the ascent, a distance of ten cubits. There he heaped up the coals on the pavement three handbreadths away from the slope, at the site where they placed the crop and the feathers and the ashes of the inner altar and the candlestick.⁹ But this would be more than thirty-one [cubits]?¹⁰ — He does not count the place of the person.¹¹

ALL WHO ASCENDED THE ALTAR, etc. What is the reason?¹² — Said R. Johanan: In the case of libations, lest they become smoke-

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

laden; and as to the burnt-offering of a bird, lest it perish through the smoke.¹³ An objection is raised: When he came to make a circuit of the altar,¹⁴ whence did he commence? From the south-east horn, [whence he successively passed to] the north-east, north-west, and south-west, and he was handed the wine to pour it out!¹⁵ — Said R. Johanan:

- (1) Thus it is valid even if he omits the draining altogether. Therefore it is certainly valid when he drains it anywhere by the altar.
- (2) Supra 63b.
- (3) Lev. II, 8. It was stated supra 63b that this means at the south-west of the altar.
- (4) Ibid. IV, 30. It is stated supra 53a and 54a that this applies to the southern base.
- (5) This implies that the proper place for the burnt-offering of a bird was the east; what then was the reason for this?
- (6) The ashes which were placed every morning by the side of the altar, to the east of the ascent.
- (7) When the bird was sacrificed by the south-west horn, he had to throw the crop and the feathers to the ash deposit, more than thirty cubits away. It requires great strength to throw anything that is very light a great distance.
- (8) The priest who removed the ashes.
- (9) V. Tam. I, 4.
- (10) Rashi gives the exact calculation.
- (11) That itself is responsible for one cubit.
- (12) Why were these different?
- (13) Of the burning wood and limbs. Hence the shortest route was taken.
- (14) This refers to the High Priest, v. Tam. VII, 3.
- (15) On to the altar. It is now assumed that he is given the wine when he commences the circuit, which shows that we are not afraid of the smoke.

Zevachim 64b

He made the circuit on foot.¹ Raba observed: That indeed may be inferred, for it teaches, ‘and he was handed the wine to pour it out’, but it does not teach,’ He was told to pour it out’.² This proves it.

Our Rabbis taught: All who went up the altar ascended by the right and descended by the left; they ascended by the east and descended by the west,³ except those who went up for these three things:⁴ they ascended by the west

and descended by the west, ascended by the right and descended by the right. [You say] ‘by the right’; it is by the left?⁵ —

Said Rabina: Read ‘left’. Raba said: ‘Right’⁶ means the right of the altar, while ‘left’⁷ means the left of the person.⁸ Then let him teach either both with reference to the altar or both with reference to the person? That is indeed a difficulty.

MISHNAH. HOW WAS THE SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD SACRIFICED?⁹ HE PINCHED OFF ITS HEAD CLOSE BY ITS NECK, BUT DID NOT SEVER IT, AND HE SPRINKLED ITS BLOOD ON THE WALL OF THE ALTAR; THE RESIDUE OF THE BLOOD WAS DRAINED OUT ON THE BASE. ONLY THE BLOOD BELONGED TO THE ALTAR, WHILE THE WHOLE OF IT BELONGED TO THE PRIESTS.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin-offering;¹⁰ [that means] with the body of the sin-offering.¹¹ How is it done? He [the priest] grasps the head and the body [of the bird] and sprinkles [its blood] on the wall of the altar, but not on the wall of the ascent, nor on the wall of the Hekal, nor on the wall of the Ulam; and which [wall] is meant? The lower wall.¹² Yet perhaps it is not so, but rather on the upper wall, and that is indeed logical: if [the blood of] an animal sin-offering is [sprinkled] above, though [that of] an animal burnt-offering is [sprinkled] below: surely [the blood of] a bird sin-offering is [sprinkled] above, seeing that [that of] a bird burnt-offering is [sprinkled] above? Therefore it states, And the rest of the blood shall be drained out at the base of the altar,¹³ [which intimates that it must be sprinkled on] a wall where the residue will drain down to the base, and which is that? The lower wall.¹⁴ Yet let us [first] perform it above, and then below?¹⁵ —

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Said Raba: Is then yamzeh [he shall drain] written? Surely yimmazeh [shall be drained] is written, which implies of its own accord.¹⁶

R. Zutra b. Tobiah said in Rab's name: How is the bird sin-offering pinched off? He grasps its two wings in two fingers, and its two legs in two fingers, stretches its neck over the width of his thumb and pinches it off. In a Baraitha it was taught: The bird is without:¹⁷ he holds its wings in two fingers and its two legs with two fingers, stretches its neck over the width of two fingers, and pinches it off; and this was a difficult rite in the Temple. This and no other? Surely there were kemizah and hafinah?¹⁸ — Say rather, this was one of the difficult rites in the Temple.

MISHNAH. HOW WAS THE BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD SACRIFICED? — HE [THE PRIEST] ASCENDED THE ASCENT AND TURNED TO THE SURROUNDING BALCONY,¹⁹ WHENCE HE MADE HIS WAY TO THE SOUTH-EAST HORN. HE NIPPED ITS HEAD CLOSE BY THE NECK, AND SEVERED IT,²⁰ SAND DRAINED OUT ITS BLOOD ON TO THE WALL OF THE ALTAR. HE TOOK THE HEAD, TURNED THE PART WHERE IT WAS NIPPED TO THE ALTAR,²¹ DRIED IT WITH SALT,²² AND THREW IT ON TO THE [ALTAR-] FIRE.²³ THEN HE CAME TO THE BODY. REMOVED THE CROP, THE FEATHERS,²⁴ AND THE ENTRAILS THAT CAME FORTH WITH IT,²⁵ AND THREW THEM ON TO THE ASH DEPOSITORY. HE RENT [THE BODY], BUT DID NOT SEVER IT, YET IF HE DID SEVER IT, IT IS FIT. THEN HE DRIED IT [THE BODY] WITH SALT, AND THREW IT ON TO THE [ALTAR-] FIRE. IF HE DID NOT REMOVE THE CROP OR THE FEATHERS OR THE ENTRAILS WHICH CAME FORTH WITH IT, AND DID NOT DRY IT WITH SALT, OR MADE ANY OTHER DEVIATION THEREIN AFTER HE HAD DRAINED THE BLOOD OUT, IT IS FIT.

IF HE SEVERED THE SIN-OFFERING²⁶ OR DID NOT SEVER THE BURNT-OFFERING, IT

IS UNFIT. IF HE DRAINED OUT THE BLOOD OF THE HEAD, BUT NOT THE BLOOD OF THE BODY, IT IS UNFIT; THE BLOOD OF THE BODY, BUT NOT THE BLOOD OF THE HEAD, IT IS FIT.

IF HE NIPPED A SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD FOR THE SAKE OF SOMETHING ELSE;²⁷ IF HE DRAINED OUT ITS BLOOD FOR THE SAKE OF SOMETHING ELSE, OR FOR ITS OWN SAKE AND FOR THE SAKE OF SOMETHING ELSE,²⁸ OR FOR THE SAKE OF SOMETHING ELSE AND FOR ITS OWN SAKE, IT IS UNFIT.

A BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD IS FIT [IN SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES]. SAVE THAT IT DOES NOT FREE ITS OWNER OF HIS OBLIGATION.²⁹ IF A SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD OR A BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD WAS NIPPED OR IF ITS BLOOD WAS DRAINED OUT [WITH THE INTENTION] TO EAT WHAT WAS NORMALLY EATEN OR TO BURN WHAT WAS NORMALLY BURNT WITHOUT BOUNDS, IT IS INVALID, BUT DOES NOT INVOLVE KARETH; AFTER TIME, IT IS PIGGUL AND INVOLVES KARETH, PROVIDED THAT THE MATTIR WAS OFFERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS.

HOW DOES HE OFFER THE MATTIR ACCORDING TO REGULATIONS? IF HE NIPPED IT IN SILENCE AND DRAINED THE BLOOD [WITH AN INTENTION OF] AFTER TIME; OR IF HE NIPPED IT [WITH AN INTENTION OF] AFTER TIME AND DRAINED THE BLOOD IN SILENCE; OR IF HE NIPPED IT AND DRAINED THE BLOOD [WITH AN INTENTION OF] AFTER TIME: IN THESE CASES HE OFFERED THE MATTIR ACCORDING TO REGULATION.

HOW DOES HE NOT OFFER THE MATTIR ACCORDING TO REGULATION? IF HE NIPPED IT [WITH AN INTENTION OF] WITHOUT BOUNDS AND DRAINED THE BLOOD [WITH AN INTENTION OF]

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

WITHOUT BOUNDS, OR IF HE NIPPED IT [WITH AN INTENTION OF] AFTER TIME AND DRAINED THE BLOOD [WITH AN INTENTION OF] WITHOUT BOUNDS; OR IF HE NIPPED IT AND DRAINED THE BLOOD [WITH AN INTENTION OF] WITHOUT BOUNDS;

(1) He was not given the wine until he completed the circuit, the circuit being made merely to add dignity to the ceremony and to show that he enjoyed privileges which the other priests lacked (Rashi and Sh. M.).

(2) Which would be the case if he already had the wine when he started.

(3) They ascended the stairway at its east side, since they would have to turn right, and had they ascended it by the west, they would have to cross the width of the ascent before they could do this. Similarly they descended by the west side of the stairway.

(4) Enumerated in the Mishnah.

(5) The west of the ascent was on the left side of a man facing the altar.

(6) In the second clause.

(7) In the first clause.

(8) Standing in front of the altar.

(9) Lit., 'made'. V. p. 312, n. 2.

(10) Lev. V, 9. — It refers to a bird sin-offering.

(11) Not from a vessel.

(12) Below the red line.

(13) Ibid.

(14) For if he sprinkled it on the upper wall, it might drain on to the terrace, not on to the base.

(15) I.e., sprinkle the blood on the upper wall, and then drain out the rest on the lower.

(16) The blood must be so sprinkled that it will then naturally drain down on to the base.

(17) It is grasped face-downward to the palm of the hand, so that its nape is uppermost.

(18) The taking of the fistful of meal-offerings and the taking of the two hands full of incense on the Day of Atonement. These rites were done in a particular fashion, and both are described as difficult in Yoma 47b and 49b.

(19) V. supra 53a notes.

(20) By nipping both the windpipe and the gullet (Hul. 21b).

(21) He pressed it against the wall, to drain out the blood.

(22) By rubbing salt on the dripping head until it became dry.

(23) Of the burnt-offerings, which were being burnt on the altar.

(24) I.e., the skin opposite the crop, together with the feathers on it.

(25) Sc. with the crop, as he removed this.

(26) By nipping both organs of the throat.

(27) E.g., as a burnt-offering.

(28) He nipped it for its own sake and drained it for the sake of something else.

(29) V. supra 2a.

Zevachim 65a

IF HE NIPPED A SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD UNDER A DIFFERENT DESIGNATION AND DRAINED THE BLOOD [WITH AN INTENTION OF] AFTER TIME; OR IF HE NIPPED IT [WITH AN INTENTION OF] AFTER TIME AND DRAINED THE BLOOD UNDER A DIFFERENT DESIGNATION; OR IF HE NIPPED IT AND DRAINED THE BLOOD UNDER A DIFFERENT DESIGNATION: IN THESE CASES HE DID NOT OFFER THE MATTIR ACCORDING TO REGULATION. [IF HE INTENDED] TO EAT AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE WITHOUT BOUNDS [AND] AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE ON THE MORROW, [OR] AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE ON THE MORROW [AND] AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE WITHOUT BOUNDS; HALF AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE WITHOUT BOUNDS [AND] HALF AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE ON THE MORROW; HALF AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE ON THE MORROW [AND] HALF AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE WITHOUT BOUNDS, [THE SACRIFICE] IS UNFIT, AND DOES NOT INVOLVE KARETH.

SAID R. JUDAH: THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: WHERE THE [WRONGFUL] INTENTION OF TIME PRECEDES THAT OF PLACE, [THE SACRIFICE] IS PIGGUL, AND INVOLVES KARETH; BUT IF THE [WRONGFUL] INTENTION OF PLACE PRECEDES THAT OF TIME, IT IS UNFIT AND DOES NOT INVOLVE KARETH. BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: IN BOTH CASES [THE SACRIFICE IS] UNFIT AND DOES NOT INVOLVE KARETH. [IF ONE INTENDS] TO EAT HALF AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE [WITHOUT BOUNDS OR AFTER TIME] [AND] TO BURN HALF AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE [SIMILARLY]. IT IS FIT, FOR EATING AND BURNING DO NOT COMBINE.¹

ZEVUCHIM – 57a-91a

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: And [the priest] shall bring it [unto the altar]:² Why is this stated? Because it is said, Then he shall bring his offering of turtle-doves, or of young pigeons,³ you might think that when he vows a bird [as a burnt-offering], he must give not less than two birds; therefore it states, ‘And [the priest] shall bring it:’ he can bring even one bird to the altar, Why is ‘the priest’ stated? To prescribe a priest for it.⁴ For you might argue, is not [the reverse] logical? If a priest was not prescribed for a sheep,⁵ though north was prescribed for it;⁶ is it not logical that a priest is not prescribed for a bird, seeing that [Scripture] did not prescribe north for it? Therefore ‘the priest’ is stated, in order to prescribe a priest for it. You might think that he must nip it with a knife, and that is indeed logical: If [Scripture] prescribed a utensil⁷ for shechitah, though it did not prescribe a priest for it; is it not logical that it prescribed a utensil for nipping, seeing that it prescribed a priest for it? Therefore it states, [And] the priest... shall pinch off [its head].⁸

Said R. Akiba: Would you then think that a Zar might approach the altar?⁹ Why then is ‘the priest’ stated? To teach that the pinching must be done by the very priest himself.¹⁰ You might think that he can pinch it off either above [the red line] or below [it]; therefore it states, ‘and pinch off [its head], and make it smoke [on the altar]:’ as haktarah [making it smoke] is [done] on the top of the altar, so is pinching [done] on the top of the altar.¹¹ ‘And shall pinch off’: Close by the nape [of the neck]. You say, close by the nape; yet perhaps it is not so, but rather by the throat?¹² It follows by logic: ‘and shall pinch off’ is stated here, and ‘and shall pinch off’ is stated elsewhere:¹³ as there it is close by its neck, so here it is close by its neck. If so, just as there he pinches but does not sever it, so here too he pinches but does not sever it? Therefore it states, ‘and shall pinch off [its head], and make it smoke’: as [in] haktarah, the head is

by itself and the body is by itself, so [after] pinching, the head is by itself and the body is by itself. And how do we know that the haktarah of the head is separate and that of the body is separate?

Because it is said, ‘And make it smoke’: thus the burning of the body is ordered. How then do I interpret, [and the priest] shall make it smoke upon the altar?¹⁴ Scripture [here] treats of the burning of the head.¹⁵ And the blood thereof shall be drained out on the side of the altar,¹⁶ but not on the wall of the ascent, nor on the wall of the Hekal. And which is it? The upper wall. Yet perhaps it is not so, but rather the lower wall; and that is indeed logical: if [the blood of] an animal burnt-offering is [sprinkled] below, though [that of] an animal sin-offering is [sprinkled] above; surely [the blood of] a burnt-offering of a bird is [sprinkled] below, seeing that [that of] a sin-offering of a bird is [sprinkled] below? Therefore it states, ‘and shall pinch off... and shall burn... and the blood thereof shall be drained out’: now, can you really think that after he has burnt it he returns and drains it?¹⁷

Rather it is to tell you: as haktarah is [done] on the top of the altar, so is the draining out on the top of the altar. How did he do this? He ascended the ascent and turned to the terrace, whence he proceeded to the south-east horn. Then he pinched off its head close by the neck, severed it, and drained [some] of its blood on the wall of the altar. If he did it below his feet¹⁸ even a cubit, it is fit.¹⁹ R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob maintained: It must essentially be done naught elsewhere but on the top of the altar. Wherein do they differ? —

Abaye and Raba both said: They differ in respect of building a pyre on the terrace.²⁰

THEN HE TOOK THE BODY, etc. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall take away its crop with the feathers thereof:²¹ that is the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

crop.²² You might think that he cuts through with a knife and takes it;²³ therefore it states, ‘with the feathers thereof’: [hence] he takes the plumage together with it. R. Abba Jose b. Hanan said: He takes it [the crop] together with the craw.²⁴ The school of R. Ishmael taught: ‘With the feathers thereof’ [means] with its [very] own feathers,²⁵ [hence] he cuts it [round] with a knife like a skylight.²⁶

- (1) V. supra 29b for the whole passage.
- (2) Lev. I, 15. This refers to a bird burnt-offering, and is apparently superfluous, since the preceding verse states, Then he shall bring his offering, etc. Hence Scripture should continue: ‘And the priest shall pinch off its head by the altar.’
- (3) Ibid. 14.
- (4) Only a priest, and not a Zar, must nip off its head.
- (5) A sheep can be slaughtered by a Zar, and the slaughtering of a sheep corresponds to the nipping of a bird.
- (6) It must be slaughtered at the north side of the altar.
- (7) Viz., a knife.
- (8) The Priest himself, without the assistance of a utensil, as R. Akiba explains.
- (9) For the bird-offering one had actually to ascend the slope of the altar and walk round the terrace (supra 64b); that would obviously not be permitted to a Zar. An animal-offering, however, which could be slaughtered by a Zar, was killed on the ground, and even at some distance from the altar.
- (10) Not with a knife.
- (11) The ‘top’ here means the upper half, above the red line.
- (12) The front part of the neck.
- (13) Lev, V, 8: and shall pinch off its head close by its neck, but shall not divide it asunder.
- (14) Lev, I, 17. This apparently a repetition of v. 15.
- (15) Hence each was separate.
- (16) Ibid. 15.
- (17) That is obviously impossible!
- (18) Stooping down,
- (19) Because the red line, which demarcated the upper part of the altar from the lower, was a cubit below the terrace.
- (20) The first Tanna holds that this can be done, therefore the blood can be drained out even below the terrace. But R. Nehemiah and R. Eliezer b. Jacob hold that the haktarah must be done on the top of the altar itself; therefore the draining too must be done near there.
- (21) Lev. I, 16.

(22) The Talmud translates the less familiar mur'ah by the more familiar zefek.

(23) Sc. the crop alone, without the skin and the feathers.

(24) The thick muscular stomach of birds.

(25) Not more than the feathers opposite the crop.

(26) He cuts the skin exactly opposite the crop, and then removes the crop, skin and feathers.

Zevachim 65b

HE RENT IT. BUT DID NOT SEVER IT. Our Rabbis taught: And he shall rend it:1 rending is by hand only, and thus it says, and he rent him as one would have rent a kid.2

IF HE DID NOT REMOVE THE CROP, etc. Our Mishnah does not agree with R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon. For it was taught. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon said: I have heard that one severs the sin-offering of a bird.3 Wherein do they differ? —

Said R. Hisda: They disagree as to whether the draining [of the blood] of the bird sin-offering is indispensable. The first Tanna4 holds that it is indispensable, and since then he must drain out the blood, when he [also] severs [it] he performs the rites of a burnt-offering with the bird sin-offering.5 Whereas R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon holds that the draining out of the bird sin-offering is not indispensable,6 therefore he is merely cutting flesh.7

Raba said: They differ about a delay at [the nipping of] the second organ in the case of a bird burnt-offering. The first Tanna holds that it does not invalidate [it], and though he does delay, he performs the rites of a burnt-offering with a sin-offering; whereas R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon holds that it does invalidate [it], and since he delays, he is merely cutting flesh.8 Abaye said: They differ as to whether [the cutting through of] the greater part of the flesh is indispensable. And they [Raba and Abaye] disagree in the same controversy as that of R. Zera and R. Samuel son of R. Isaac: One maintains that they [the first Tanna and R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon]

disagree on whether delay at the second organ invalidates; and the other maintains that they disagree as to whether the [cutting of] the greater part of the flesh is indispensable.⁹ Now, this proves that in the first place we require [the cutting of] the greater part of the flesh?¹⁰ —

Yes, and it was taught likewise: How is the melikah of a bird sin-offering performed? He cuts through the spinal column and the nape, without the greater part of the flesh, until he reaches the gullet or the windpipe. When he reaches the gullet or the windpipe he cuts one organ, or the greater part thereof, together with the greater part of the flesh; and in the case of a burnt-offering, two [organs] or the greater part thereof.¹¹ This was stated before R. Jeremiah.¹² Said he: Have they not heard what R. Simeon b. Eliakim said on the authority of R. Eleazar b. Pedath on the authority of R. Eleazar b. Shammu'a: R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon affirmed: I have heard that a bird sin-offering is severed, and what does he shall not divide it asunder¹³ mean?

(1) Ibid., 17.

(2) Jud. XIV, 6. There, of course, it was done by hand.

(3) In the sense that if both organs of the throat are nipped, it is not unfit. Our Mishnah states that it is.

(4) The Tanna of our Mishnah.

(5) For now the rites do not differ in any way, and it is stated infra 66a that such is unfit. Though the blood of the sin-offering is sprinkled below and that of the burnt-offering is sprinkled above the red line, that is not regarded as a sufficient distinction (Tosaf.).

(6) Whereas it is in the case of a burnt-offering.

(7) When he nips the second organ. By refraining from draining out the blood after this he makes it clear that he is not performing the rites of a burnt-offering.

(8) The shechitah of an animal consists of cutting through both organs of the throat, viz., the windpipe and the gullet; should a delay occur between these two organs, it is invalid, and the animal is nebelah (q.v. Glos.). The shechitah of a bird (of hullin) consists of cutting through one organ only (the second is optional), since that is sufficient to kill it. Now, a bird burnt-offering must

have both organs pinched (which is the equivalent of cut) through, and this can be done without delay between the organs; but when one nips both organs of a bird sin-offering, delay is inevitable, owing to the particular manner in which the rite must be performed, as stated infra. The first Tanna holds that delay between the two organs in the case of a burnt-offering does not invalidate the sacrifice, because the nipping of the second organ is not really part of the shechitah at all. Hence when he nips both organs of a sin-offering, he performs the same rite as would be valid in the case of a burnt-offering, and therefore it (the sin-offering) is unfit. R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon holds that delay in the case of a burnt-offering does invalidate the sacrifice, and since delay is inevitable in the case of a sin-offering, it is obvious that he is not treating it like a burnt-offering.

(9) After the priest nips the first organ, he must also cut through the greater part of the flesh that surrounds it (v. infra), and this naturally makes a delay before the second organ inevitable. Abaye explains that all hold that a delay at the second organ of a burnt-offering invalidates the sacrifice, but they disagree as to whether the cutting through of the flesh in the case of a sin-offering is indispensable. The first Tanna holds that it is not indispensable, hence it is possible to nip both organs without a delay, and so it becomes like the rites of a burnt-offering and is therefore invalid. But R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon holds that this cutting through is indispensable; hence there must be a delay between the organs, and thereby it differs from a burnt-offering.

(10) Since they disagree on whether it is indispensable, it follows that it is certainly necessary.

(11) V. Hul. 21a. — By 'cut' is meant with his nail, not with a knife.

(12) Sc. the controversies of the Amoraim on the points of difference between the first Tanna and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon.

(13) Lev. I, 17.

Zevachim 66a

He need not sever it.¹ Said R. Aha the son of Raba to R. Ashi: If so, when it is written in connection with a pit, [And if a man shall open a pit...] and not cover it,² does that too mean that he need not cover it? — How compare! There, since it is written, the owner of the pit shall make it good.³ he is [obviously] bound to cover it. But here, consider: it is written, And [the priest] shall bring [offer] it

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

[unto the altar],⁴ [whereby] the Writ drew a distinction between a bird sin-offering and a bird burnt-offering. What then is the purpose of ‘he shall not divide it asunder’?⁵ Infer from this that he need not sever it.⁶

IF HE DRAINED THE BLOOD OF THE BODY. Our Rabbis taught: A burnt-offering⁷ [teaches that] even if he drained the blood of the body but did not drain the blood of the head [it is still a valid burnt-offering].⁸ You might think that even if he drained the blood of the head, but not the blood of the body [it is valid]; therefore it states, ‘it is’.⁹ How does this imply it?¹⁰ — Said Rabina: It is logical, for most of the blood is found in the body.¹¹

CHAPTER VII

MISHNAH. IF A SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD IS OFFERED¹² BELOW [THE RED LINE] WITH THE RITES OF A SIN-OFFERING¹³ [AND] FOR THE SAKE OF A SIN-OFFERING, IT IS FIT. [IF IT IS OFFERED] WITH THE RITES OF A SIN-OFFERING, [BUT] IN THE NAME OF A BURNT-OFFERING; [OR] WITH THE RITES OF A BURNT-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A SIN-OFFERING; OR WITH THE RITES OF A BURNT-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A BURNT-OFFERING, IT IS UNFIT.

IF HE OFFERS IT ABOVE [THE RED LINE]. [EVEN] WITH THE RITES OF ANY OF THESE,¹⁴ IT IS UNFIT. IF A BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD IS OFFERED ABOVE, WITH THE RITES OF A BURNT-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A BURNT-OFFERING, IT IS FIT; WITH THE RITES OF A BURNT-OFFERING [BUT] IN THE NAME OF A SIN-OFFERING, IT IS FIT¹⁵ BUT DOES NOT FREE ITS OWNER OF HIS OBLIGATION.¹⁵ [IF HE OFFERS IT] WITH THE RITES OF A SIN-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A BURNT-OFFERING; [OR] WITH THE RITES OF A SIN-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A SIN-OFFERING, IT IS UNFIT. IF HE OFFERS IT BELOW, [EVEN] WITH THE RITES OF ANY OF THESE,¹⁶ IT IS UNFIT.

(1) The foregoing controversies of the Amoraim assumed that R. Eleazar merely meant that the sacrifice is not unfit if he does sever it, but that nevertheless he may not sever it in the first place. But on the present interpretation he differs from the first Tanna on the very law itself.

(2) Ex. XXI, 33.

(3) Ibid. 34.

(4) Lev. I, 15. This refers to the burnt-offering.

(5) In Lev. V, 8, referring to the sin-offering.

(6) In Hul. 21a R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon deduces from this ‘shall bring it’ that the priest must sever the neck of a burnt-offering by nipping both organs; and further, that in this respect Scripture draws a distinction between a burnt-offering and a sin-offering. Now, if ‘he shall not divide it asunder’ means that he may not sever it, then the distinction would merely justify us in saying that in the case of a burnt-offering he may sever it, but not that he must. Hence it must mean, he need not sever it, and then the distinction shows that he must sever a burnt-offering.

(7) Lev. I, 17.

(8) ‘A burnt-offering’ here is superfluous, since the context makes it perfectly clear. Hence it is interpreted to mean that it still counts as such even if something of its rites is omitted.

(9) This is emphatic, intimating that it must be done with the proper rites.

(10) Perhaps it is the reverse?

(11) Hence that it at least must be drained out.

(12) Lit., ‘made’ — i.e., its blood is sprinkled.

(13) Viz., nipping one organ only, and sprinkling and draining the blood.

(14) Enumerated above, i.e., even with the rites and in the name of a sin-offering.

(15) V. supra 2a.

(16) Cf. n. 3.

Zevachim 66b

GEMARA. Wherein does he deviate?¹ If we say that he deviates in melikah?² Shall we then say that it does not agree with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon, who said: I have heard that one severs a bird sin-offering? — But have we not explained that it does not agree with R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon?³ — No:⁴ [it means] that he deviates in the sprinkling.⁵ That too is logical, since the sequel teaches, **IF HE OFFERS IT ABOVE, EVEN WITH THE RITES OF ANY OF THESE, IT IS UNFIT,** [which means] even with the rites of a sin-offering [and] in the name of a sin-offering.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Now, wherein does he deviate?⁶ If you say that he deviates in melikah, surely a master said: If he performed its melikah on any part of the altar, it is fit? Hence it must surely mean that he deviates in sprinkling, and since the second clause means in sprinkling, the first clause too means in sprinkling! — Why interpret it thus? Each is governed by its own circumstances.⁷

IF A BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD, etc. Wherein does he deviate?⁸ If we say, that he deviates in melikah,⁹ then when he [the Tanna] teaches in the sequel:¹⁰ ‘All of these do not defile in the gullet,¹¹ and involve trespass’;¹² shall we say that this does not agree with R. Joshua; for if it agreed with R. Joshua, surely he ruled [that] they do not involve trespass?¹³ —

Rather, [he deviated] in draining [the blood].¹⁴ Then consider the subsequent clause: If one offered a burnt-offering of a bird below [the red line] with the rites of a sin-offering [and] in the name of a sin-offering. R. Eliezer maintains: It involves trespass; R. Joshua said: It does not involve trespass. Now, wherein did he deviate? If we say, in draining; granted that R. Joshua ruled [thus] where he deviated in melikah, did he rule [thus] in reference to draining?⁵ Hence it must mean, in melikah: then the first and the last clauses refer to melikah, while the middle clause refers to draining? — Yes: the first and the last clauses refer to melikah, while the middle clause refers to draining.

MISHNAH. AND ALL OF THESE¹⁵ DO NOT DEFILE IN THE GULLET¹⁶ AND INVOLVE TRESPASS,¹⁷ EXCEPT THE SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD WHICH WAS OFFERED BELOW [THE RED LINE] WITH THE RITES OF A SIN-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A SIN-OFFERING.¹⁸ IF ONE OFFERED THE BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD BELOW WITH THE RITES OF A SIN-OFFERING [AND] IN THE NAME OF A SIN-OFFERING, R. ELIEZER MAINTAINED: IT INVOLVES TRESPASS;¹⁹ R.

JOSHUA RULED: IT DOES NOT INVOLVE TRESPASS.²⁰ SAID R. ELIEZER: IF A SIN-OFFERING INVOLVES TRESPASS WHEN [THE PRIEST], DEVIATED IN ITS NAME,²¹ THOUGH IT DOES NOT INVOLVE TRESPASS WHEN [IT IS OFFERED] IN ITS OWN NAME, IS IT NOT LOGICAL THAT A BURNT-OFFERING INVOLVES TRESPASS IF HE DEVIATED IN ITS NAME, SEEING THAT IT INVOLVES TRESPASS [WHEN HE OFFERED IT] IN ITS OWN NAME?²²

NO, ANSWERED R. JOSHUA: WHEN YOU SPEAK OF A SIN-OFFERING WHOSE NAME HE ALTERED TO THAT OF A BURNT-OFFERING, [IT INVOLVES TRESPASS] BECAUSE HE CHANGED ITS NAME TO SOMETHING THAT INVOLVES TRESPASS; WILL YOU SAY [THE SAME] OF A BURNT-OFFERING WHOSE NAME HE CHANGED TO THAT OF A SIN-OFFERING, SEEING THAT HE CHANGED ITS NAME TO SOMETHING WHICH DOES NOT INVOLVE TRESPASS?²³

- (1) When he offers a sin-offering with the rites of a burnt-offering.
- (2) Nipping both organs, and thus severing it.
- (3) Supra 65b. The same obviously applies here: What then is your difficulty?
- (4) This Mishnah can be explained as agreeing even with him.
- (5) Instead of first sprinkling some of the blood (v. Lev. V, 9), he drains out the whole of it, thus treating it like a burnt-offering (I, 15).
- (6) Which rite does he perform above?
- (7) The sequel, it is true, can only refer to a deviation in sprinkling, yet the first clause can still refer to a deviation in melikah.
- (8) When he performs the rites of a sin-offering.
- (9) He does not sever it.
- (10) The next Mishnah, which is the sequel to this.
- (11) V. p. 176. n. 10.
- (12) V. p. 257. n. 1 and note on next Mishnah.
- (13) If the melikah is not done properly.
- (14) There R. Joshua agrees. For R. Joshua's reason, as stated infra, will not apply. (11) He did not, as already stated.
- (15) Enumerated in the preceding Mishnah.
- (16) V. p. 257. no. 1. Though they are unfit, the melikah frees them from the uncleanness of nebelah.
- (17) v. p. 176, n. 10. If their rites were properly performed, they would no longer involve trespass, since they would be permitted to the priests, which

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

is secular benefit. Since, however, they became unfit, and so were not permitted at any time, they retain the trespass, involving status which they possessed before they were offered. This applies even to a sin-offering, save for the exception which follows.

(18) Since that is fit, and there is a time when it is permitted to the priests; hence even a Zar is not liable to trespass.

(19) For it is a burnt-offering, and at no time was it permitted to the priests.

(20) For it has become a sin-offering through all these deviations, and is permitted.

(21) For it is then unfit and not permitted to the priests.

(22) Since a burnt-offering must be altogether burnt, and is not permitted at any time.

(23) Surely not.

Zevachim 67a

SAID R. ELIEZER TO HIM: LET SACRED SACRIFICES WHICH ARE SLAUGHTERED IN THE SOUTH AND IN THE NAME OF LESSER SACRIFICES, PROVE IT: FOR HE CHANGED THEIR NAME TO SOMETHING WHICH DOES NOT INVOLVE TRESPASS, AND YET THEY INVOLVE TRESPASS.² SO ALSO, DO NOT WONDER THAT IN THE CASE OF THE BURNT-OFFERING, ALTHOUGH HE CHANGED ITS NAME TO SOMETHING THAT DOES NOT INVOLVE TRESPASS, IT INVOLVES TRESPASS.

NOT SO, REPLIED R. JOSHUA: IF YOU SAY THUS OF MOST SACRED SACRIFICES WHICH ARE SLAUGHTERED IN THE SOUTH AND IN THE NAME OF LESSER SACRIFICES, [THEY INVOLVE TRESPASS] BECAUSE HE CHANGED THEIR NAME TO SOMETHING WHICH IS PARTLY FORBIDDEN AND PARTLY PERMITTED;³ WILL YOU SAY THE SAME OF A BURNT-OFFERING, WHERE HE CHANGED ITS NAME TO SOMETHING THAT IS ALTOGETHER PERMITTED?⁴

GEMARA. It was taught: R. Eliezer said to R. Joshua: Let a guilt-offering slaughtered in the north as a peace-offering prove it; though he changed its name, it involves trespass.⁵ So need you not wonder that a burnt-offering

involves trespass even though he changed its name. Said R. Joshua to him: No. If you say thus of a guilt-offering, where he changed its name but not its place,⁶ will you say [the same] of a burnt-offering, where he changed its name and its place?

Said R. Eliezer to him: Let a guilt-offering slaughtered in the south as a peace-offering prove it, where he changed its name and its place, yet it involves trespass. So need you not wonder that a burnt-offering involves trespass even though he changed its name and changed its place. No, replied R. Joshua. If you say [thus] of a guilt-offering, where [though] he changed its name and its place, he did not deviate in its rites; will you say [the same] of a burnt-offering, where he changed its name and its place and its rites? Thereupon he was silent. Said Raba: Why was he silent?⁷ He could answer him: Let a guilt-offering which one slaughtered in the south, in the name of a peace-offering and with change of owner,⁸ prove it, where he changed its name and its place and its rites,⁹ and yet it involves trespass. Now, since he did not answer him thus, you may infer that R. Eliezer discerned R. Joshua's reason.¹⁰ For R. Adda b. Ahabah said: R. Joshua maintained: If a bird burnt-offering was offered below with the rites of a sin-offering and in the name of a sin-offering, immediately he nipped one organ thereof it is transmuted into a bird sin-offering.¹¹ If so, a bird sin-offering which was offered above [the red line] with the rites of a burnt-offering [and] in the name of a burnt-offering, as soon as he nips one organ of it, let it be transmuted through the other organ into a bird burnt-offering? And should you say, That indeed is so,¹² surely R. Johanan said in R. Banna'ah's name: That is the tenor of the Mishnah.¹³ Does that not mean, That is the tenor of the Mishnah, but no more?¹⁴ — No: [it means,] that is the tenor of the whole Mishnah.¹⁵

R. Ashi said: As for a bird burnt-offering offered below with the rites of a sin-offering

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

[and] in the name of a sin-offering, it is well:¹⁶ since the fitness of the latter requires one organ, whereas that of the former requires both organs, while a bird burnt-offering cannot be offered below, immediately he nips one organ, it is transmuted into a bird sin-offering. But when one offers a bird sin-offering above with the rites of a burnt-offering [and] in the name of a burnt-offering, since a master said, Melikah is valid wherever it is done, immediately he nips one organ, it becomes unfit;¹⁷ when therefore he nips the second organ, how can it be transmuted into a bird burnt-offering?¹⁸

The [above] text [stated]: ‘R. Adda b. Ahabah said: R. Joshua maintained: If a bird burnt-offering was offered below with the rites of a sin-offering [and] in the name of a sin-offering, immediately he nipped one organ thereof, it is transmuted into a bird sin-offering.’

(1) Thus they were treated altogether like lesser sacrifices, both in name and in the place of slaughtering.

(2) For since they became unfit through being slaughtered in the south, the subsequent sprinkling does not permit them that they should no longer involve trespass.

(3) The flesh is permitted, but the emurim are forbidden and involve trespass.

(4) No part of a bird sin-offering is forbidden.

(5) Rashi: before the sprinkling of the blood, but not after, for then it is eaten by priests. Tosaf.: even after the sprinkling, as R. Eliezer holds that a guilt-offering slaughtered under a different designation is unfit and may not be eaten (supra 2a).

(6) He slaughtered it in the right place.

(7) Emended text (Sh. M.).

(8) I.e., in the name of a different person.

(9) Change of owner is equivalent to change of rites.

(10) Which applies only to a bird burnt-offering.

(11) For the latter requires one organ only. Hence immediately one organ is nipped, there is absolutely nothing to distinguish it from a sin-offering, and so it does turn into one before it can become unfit through having its rites incorrectly performed. This reason can only apply to a bird

burnt-offering, for animal sacrifices require the cutting of both organs.

(12) And it is fit. On this hypothesis the Mishnah which states that it is unfit will not agree with R. Joshua.

(13) The Mishnah is to be understood as it is read.

(14) I.e., exactly as it reads, viz., that R. Joshua disagrees only where stated.

(15) That he disagrees in respect of both a burnt-offering and a sin-offering.

(16) That R. Joshua disagrees and holds that it is fit.

(17) For it was properly nipped (the wrong place not affecting it) as a sin-offering, but under a different designation, which renders it unfit (supra 2a).

(18) Hence here R. Joshua agrees with the Mishnah.

Zevachim 67b

Come and hear. In the case of a sin-offering for one and a burnt-offering for the other,¹ if he [the priest] offered both above [the red line],² half is fit and half is unfit;³ [if he offered] both below, half is fit and half is unfit;³ [if he offered] one above and one below, both are unfit, for I assume that he offered the sin-offering above and the burnt-offering below.⁴ Yet even granted that he did offer the burnt-offering below, let it be transmuted into a bird sin-offering?⁵ Granted that R. Joshua ruled thus in the case of one man, did he rule so in the case of two men?⁶

Come and hear: In the case of a sin-offering and a burnt-offering and an unspecified [sacrifice] and a specified [sacrifice].⁷ if he [the priest] offered all of them above,⁸ half are fit and half are unfit;⁹ [if he offered] all of them below, half are fit and half are unfit.⁹ [If he offered] half of them above and half of them below, only the undefined [pair] are fit,¹⁰ and they share them.¹¹ Thus, the defined ones are not [fit]. Yet why so? even granted that he offered the burnt-offering below, let it be transmuted into a sin-offering?¹² And should you answer, This does not agree with R. Joshua — can you say so? Surely we learnt:¹³ If a woman declared, I vow a pair of birds if I give birth to a male child,¹⁴ and she

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

bore a male child, she must bring two pairs, one for her vow, and one for her statutory obligation. When she gives them to the priest, the priest must offer three above and one below.¹⁵ If he did not do thus, but offered two above and two below, not having consulted her,¹⁶ she must bring another bird and offer it above, [if both were] of the same species.¹⁷ But if they were of two species,¹⁸ she must bring two [birds].¹⁹ If she defined her vow, she must bring another three birds [and offer them] above [the line], [if both were] of the same species; [if they were] of two species, she must bring four.²⁰ If she fixed [the time of] her vow,

(1) After birth confinement a woman, if poor, brings two birds for a burnt-offering and a sin-offering (Lev. XII, 8). Now, two women had each brought one bird for a burnt-offering and a sin-offering respectively. Then they bought a brace together, appointed one bird for a sin-offering and one for a burnt-offering, as each required, and gave them to the priest.

(2) I.e., as burnt-offerings.

(3) What is offered in the right place is fit; the other is unfit.

(4) I.e., he may have done so.

(5) So that there should be no further liability to a sin-offering.

(6) Obviously not. For one woman's burnt-offering cannot acquit the other woman of her liability to a sin-offering.

(7) Rashi: Two women, A and B, each owed a bird burnt-offering and a bird sin-offering (e.g., on account of confinement). In addition A owed another bird burnt-offering and B another bird sin-offering (either on account of another confinement or on account of sin. Lev. V, 7-, each having brought so far one sacrifice only). Now, A and B accordingly bought three pairs of birds in conjunction. They took one of the pairs and appointed one bird a burnt-offering for A and one a sin-offering for B. The second pair they left unspecified, not stating which was a burnt-offering and which a sin-offering. The third they did specify, i.e., they appointed one for a burnt-offering and the other for a sin-offering, but did not state the owner of each. V. Kin. III, 3.

(8) As burnt-offerings.

(9) Cf. p. 331. n. 5. The women still owe the sacrifices which are now unfit.

(10) Since the owners did not define them, it depends on the priest.

(11) One sacrifice counting to each. V. ibid. 4.

(12) For since the owners were not specified, the answer given above obviously no longer applies.

(13) Emended text (Sh. M.); cur. edd. 'Come and hear'.

(14) In addition to her statutory obligation.

(15) A sin-offering cannot be vowed. Hence the additional pair are both burnt-offerings, which makes three in all. These naturally must be offered above the red line.

(16) Why she brought two pairs. Thus he thought that both pairs were statutory obligations.

(17) If both pairs were turtle-doves or young pigeons.

(18) One pair were turtle-doves, and the other pair were young pigeons.

(19) One bird of one pair has become unfit, and the pair must be completed with a bird of the same species. Since we do not know which bird actually became unfit, she must bring another two, viz., a turtle-dove and a pigeon.

(20) When she vowed, she declared which birds she would bring, but subsequently forgot which she had vowed. Hence when she came to fulfill her vow, she needed two pairs for the vow alone, viz., a pair of turtle-doves and a pair of pigeons, to cover both contingencies, and in addition one pair of either on account of her statutory obligation, i.e., three pairs in all. She, however, had brought only two pairs of which the first was offered for her statutory obligation, while the second was left for her vow, and of that one bird became unfit. Therefore she now owes one bird of the same species to replace the unfit one, and a pair of the other species, in case it was the other species that she had vowed. But if the two pairs which she had brought were of different species, she must now bring four birds, all for burnt-offerings, because we do not know which species was offered second for the vow, and it is that species which must be completed. She cannot simply bring a pair of one species, for she does not know whether she owes one turtle-dove and two pigeons, or vice versa. Therefore she must bring two turtle-doves and two pigeons and declare: 'Let one of these, of the species which I vowed, replace the one that became unfit, and let the second of that pair be another votive offering. And let the second pair cover the doubt of my definite declaration.'

Zevachim 68a

she must bring another five birds [to be sacrificed] above, [if she had vowed] of one species; if of two, she must bring six.¹ If she gave them to the priest, but does not know what she gave; and the priest went and

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

offered them, but he does not know how he offered them, she now requires four birds on account of her vow and two on account of her statutory obligation, and one sin-offering. Ben ‘Azzai said: Two sin-offerings. R. Joshua observed: This is the case where they [the Sages] said: When it is alive it has one voice, and when it is dead, it has seven voices!² — Granted that R. Joshua ruled thus in respect of liberating it from trespass, did he rule thus in respect of converting it into an obligatory offering?³

MISHNAH. [IN REGARD TO] ALL UNFIT PERSONS WHO PERFORMED MELIKAH, THE MELIKAH IS INVALID, AND THEY [THE SACRIFICES] DO NOT DEFILE IN THE GULLET.⁴ IF HE [THE PRIEST] NIPPED [THEM] WITH HIS LEFT [HAND] OR AT NIGHT; IF HE SLAUGHTERED HULLIN WITHIN⁵ OR A SACRIFICE WITHOUT [THE TEMPLE COURT]. THEY DO NOT DEFILE IN THE GULLET.⁶ IF HE NIPPED WITH A KNIFE; OR IF HE NIPPED HULLIN WITHIN [OR] SACRIFICES WITHOUT;

(1) If she vowed to bring the additional offerings at the same time as her statutory obligation, and then brought two pairs of birds to the priest, who offered them as above, she owes another five or six, as stated. For her vow made her liable to three burnt-offerings together, had she remembered what she had vowed. As she did not remember, she required five burnt-offerings in the first place, one for her statutory obligation, and four consisting of a pair of pigeons and a pair of turtle-doves, since she did not know which she owed. Now, what she has already brought does not count, for she does not know these were the birds which she had vowed. Nor can she simply bring another four on account of the vow, since these must be sacrificed at the same time as the statutory offering. Hence she must now bring five, one for the statutory offering and four on account of the vow, whilst the first which was sacrificed as her statutory obligation will count as a votive offering. If, however, she had vowed them of two species, she does not know which species she owes. Therefore she must bring six: viz., two turtle-doves and two pigeons on account of the doubt of what she had specified, and one turtle-dove and one pigeon because the former had to be offered at the same time as her statutory obligation.

(2) If she gave the birds to the priest but does not know whether they were turtle-doves or pigeons, or a pair of each, and she does not know how the priest sacrificed them, whether all above or all below or half above and half below, perhaps she did not even fulfill her statutory obligation. For he may have sacrificed all above, so that she lacks a sin-offering; or all below, and she lacks a burnt-offering. She must then bring four birds for her vow, since she does not remember which of the two species she specified, and two for her statutory burnt-offering, viz., a turtle-dove and a pigeon, as possibly the first were all offered below, as sin-offerings, and now she requires a burnt-offering of the same species. Or perhaps the first were offered half above and half below, and she has fulfilled her obligation with the first pair offered. But as she had vowed to bring a burnt-offering at the same time and of the same species as the statutory burnt-offering, she must now bring a turtle-dove and a pigeon to cover this doubt. In addition, she must bring one sin-offering of whichever species she wishes, for perhaps the first were all offered below, and this will combine with the bird she brought as her burnt-offering. Though she has already brought the latter, yet the sin-offering need not be of the same species as the first, according to the Rabbis who disagree with Ben ‘Azzai, for they hold that it all depends on the sin-offering. Therefore, since she must bring two burnt-offerings, as explained, that of the same species as the sin-offering combines with it. But Ben ‘Azzai holds that it all depends on the first, i.e., a sin-offering must be brought of the same species as the first burnt-offering which was correctly offered for her statutory obligation. Now, perhaps all the first were offered above, in which case she has fulfilled this obligation, and so she must bring a sin-offering of the same species. As, however, she does not know which species this was, she must bring two sin-offerings, one of each. R. Joshua observes that this is similar to what the Rabbis said about a ram, that when it is alive it has one voice only, but when it is dead it has seven: i.e., the two horns are used for two trumpets (bugle-horns); out of the two legs two reed-pipes (flutes) are made; the skin is used for tabrets; the entrails for a lyre, and the guts for harps. In a similar way here too, when she vowed and did not know what she had specified, she merely required four birds and two for her statutory obligation. Whereas now that she has already brought four, she still needs another eight, four on account of her vow and four on account of her obligation; v. Kin. III, 6. — Since R. Joshua makes this comment, you may infer that he accepts these laws; hence the difficulty of 67b.

(3) Surely not! This is the answer to the difficulty: The burnt-offering is transmuted only in so far

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

that it no longer involves trespass, but the deviation in its rites cannot turn it into a sin-offering to acquit its owner of his obligation for same.

(4) v. p. 257. n. 1. Although the melikah is invalid, it frees the birds from uncleanness. The reason is because they became unfit in the sanctuary, and the melikah is effective in that if they are taken up on to the altar, they are not removed. Therefore the birds are not regarded as nebelah.

(5) A bird of hullin, with ritual shechitah.

(6) Although there must be no shechitah (of birds of hullin) within, or of consecrated birds anywhere at all, yet these do not defile.

Zevachim 68b

OR [IF HE SACRIFICED] TURTLE-DOVES BEFORE THEIR TIME OR PIGEONS AFTER THEIR TIME;¹ [OR A BIRD] WHOSE WING WAS WITHERED, [OR] BLIND IN THE EYE. [OR] WHOSE FOOT WAS CUT OFF, — [ALL THESE] DEFILE IN THE GULLET. THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: ALL WHOSE UNFITNESS [AROSE] IN THE SANCTUARY² DO NOT DEFILE IN THE GULLET; IF THEIR UNFITNESS DID NOT ARISE IN THE SANCTUARY, THEY DEFILE IN THE GULLET.

GEMARA. Rab said: [If they were nipped with] the left [hand] or at night, they do not defile in the gullet; [by] a Zar or [with] a knife, they do defile in the gullet. Why is the left [hand] different; [presumably] because it is fit on the Day of Atonement; and likewise night is fit in respect of [the burning of] the limbs and the fats;³ then surely a Zar too is fit for shechitah?⁴ —

Shechitah is not a [sacrificial] rite.⁵ Is it not? Surely R. Zera said: Shechitah of the [red] heifer by a Zar is invalid, and Rab observed thereon: [The reason is because] ‘Eleazar’ and ‘statute’ [are written in connection with it]?⁶ — The [red] heifer is different, because it is of the holy things of the Temple repair. Does it not then follow a fortiori; if the holy things of the Temple repair require priesthood, surely the holy objects dedicated to the altar require priesthood? —

Said R. Shisha the son of R. Idi: Let it be analogous to the inspection of [leprous] plagues, which is not a rite, and yet requires priesthood.⁷ But let us learn it from the high places?⁸ — One cannot learn from the high places.⁹ Can one not? Surely it was taught: How do we know that if [flesh] which went out ascended [the altar], it does not descend? Because [flesh that] goes out is fit at the high places! — The Tanna relies on the text, This is the law of the burnt-offering.¹⁰ But R. Johanan maintained: [If a] Zar [performed melikah] it does not defile in the gullet; [if melikah was done with] a knife, it does defile in the gullet.

We learnt: [IN REGARD TO] ALL UNFIT PERSONS WHO PERFORMED MELIKAH, THE MELIKAH IS INVALID. As for R. Johanan, it is well: ALL includes a zar;¹¹ but according to Rab, what does ALL include? — It is surely to include [melikah with] the left [hand] and [at] night. [But] the left [hand] and night are explicitly taught? — He [the Tanna] teaches and then explains.¹²

Come and hear: THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: ALL WHOSE UNFITNESS [AROSE] IN THE SANCTUARY DO NOT DEFILE GARMENTS [WHEN THE FLESH OF THE BIRD IS] IN THE GULLET.¹³ As for R. Johanan, it is well: ALL includes a Zar. But according to Rab, what does it include?

(1) Only fully grown turtle-doves or young pigeons might be sacrificed. Otherwise they are not eligible, and therefore it is as though he nipped hullin.

(2) Birds which were brought to the Temple court fit, and there became unfit.

(3) On the Day of Atonement the spoon containing incense was taken with the left hand. The limbs and fats of sacrifices were burnt at night. Thus in two instances the left hand and night are fit for service, and presumably for that reason he rules that even in the present case, though they are not fit, they free them from uncleanness.

(4) An animal sacrifice might be slaughtered by a Zar.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(5) Whereas the taking of the spoon and the burning of the limbs are sacrificial rites.

(6) Cf. Num. XIX, 2.

(7) For notes v. supra 14b.

(8) Where a Zar might perform melikah (v. infra 113a). By the same reasoning melikah by a Zar even in the Temple should free the bird from defilement.

(9) Because by comparison with the Temple they were non-sacred.

(10) Lev. VI, 2. For notes v. supra 51a. He does not really learn it from the high places at all.

(11) It is a general principle that 'all' is an extension.

(12) First he states the law in general, and then he explains who are meant in the word ALL.

(13) 'Garments' is absent in the Mishnah.

Zevachim 69a

Yet even on your view, what does [the clause] **IF THEIR UNFITNESS DID NOT ARISE IN THE SANCTUARY** include?¹ Rather, the first clause includes shechitah of [bird] sacrifices within,² while the second clause includes melikah of hullin without.³ It was taught in accordance with R. Johanan: If a Zar nipped it; or if an unfit person nipped it; or [if it was] Piggul, nothar or [an] unclean [sacrifice].⁴ it does not defile in the gullet.⁵

R. Isaac said: I have heard two [laws], one relating to kemizah⁶ by a Zar and the other to melikah by a Zar: one descends and the other does not descend, but I do not know which is which.⁷ Said Hezekiah: It is logical that [in the case of] kemizah it goes down, while [in the case of] melikah it does not go down. Why is melikah different? [presumably] because it was done at the high places?⁸ [but] kemizah too was done at the high places? And should you say, There were no meal-offerings at the high places; then there were no bird[-offerings] at the high places [either].⁹ For R. Shesheth said: On the view that there were meal-offerings at the high places, there were bird[-offerings] at the high places; on the view that there were no meal-offerings, there were no bird [-offerings]. What is the reason? [And sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord];¹⁰ offerings [implies,] but not birds;

offerings [implies,] but not meal-offerings!¹¹ — Say rather: There was no sanctification of a meal-offering in service vessels at the high places.¹²

IF HE NIPPED [THEM] WITH HIS LEFT [HAND] OR AT NIGHT, etc. Our Rabbis taught: You might think that melikah, which is [done] within, defiles garments [when the flesh is] in the gullet;¹³ therefore it states, [And every soul that eateth] nebelah [that which dieth of itself] [... he shall wash his clothes etc].¹⁴ [But] this too is nebelah?¹⁵ — Rather, it states 'Terefah' [that which is torn of beasts];¹⁶ as Terefah does not permit the forbidden, so everything which does not permit the forbidden [is included]: thus melikah, which is [performed] within, is excluded: since it permits the forbidden. it does not defile garments [when the flesh is] in the gullet.¹⁷ Hence it includes melikah (Mnemonic: *Kez Hefez*)¹⁸ of sacrifices without, and melikah of hullin both within and without: since they do not permit the forbidden, they defile garments [when the flesh is] in the gullet.

Another [Baraitha] taught: You might think that the shechitah of hullin within and [that of] sacrifices both within and without defile in the gullet: therefore nebelah is stated. But this too is 'nebelah'?¹⁹ — Rather, therefore it states 'Terefah': as Terefah is the same within and without,²⁰ so all which are the same within and without [are included in this law]: thus the shechitah of hullin within and [that of] sacrifices within and without is excluded: since these are not the same within as without, they do not defile garments [when the flesh is] in the gullet. As for hullin, it is well: that is not the same within as without;²¹ but sacrifices are unfit in both cases? —

Said Raba: If shechitah without is effective in that it involves kareth,²² shall it not be effective in cleansing it from [the defilement of] nebelah?²³ We have thus found [it of shechitah] without; how do we know [it of

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

shechitah] within? — Because it is not the same within as without.²⁴ If so, when one performs melikah on sacrifices without, they too [should] not [defile], since within is not the same as without?²⁵ —

Said R. Shimi b. Ashi: You infer that which does not make it fit from that which does not make it fit.²⁶ but you do not infer that which does not make it fit from that which does make it fit.²⁷ Do you not? Surely it was taught: How do we know that [if flesh] which went out ascended [the altar] it does not descend? Because [flesh] that goes out is fit at the high places? — The Tanna relies on the extension intimated in, ‘This is the law of the burnt-offering’²⁸

MISHNAH. IF ONE PERFORMED MELIKAH, AND IT [THE BIRD] WAS FOUND TO BE TEREFAH. R. MEIR SAID: IT DOES NOT DEFILE IN THE GULLET;

- (1) For the ALL of the first clause applies to that too.
- (2) That such do not defile.
- (3) That such do defile.
- (4) I.e., if the flesh of a bird sacrifice became defiled after it was properly offered up.
- (5) For only nebelah does this. — The ruling thus agrees with R. Johanan.
- (6) V. Glos.
- (7) Either a bird-offering nipped by a Zar or a meal-offering whose kemizah was performed by a Zar does not descend from the altar if it was taken up there.
- (8) By a Zar.
- (9) Hence no melikah.
- (10) Ex. XXIV. 5. This was before the erection of the Tabernacle, and so the equivalent of the high places.
- (11) The Heb. is applicable to animals only.
- (12) He holds that there were both bird- and meal-offerings at the high places. But whereas melikah by a Zar in the Temple can be learnt from that of the high places (in so far, at least, that it does not descend), kemizah can not. For at the high places meal-offerings were not sanctified in service vessels, whereas in the Temple they were. That being so, when kemizah is performed by a Zar it is unfit to that extent that even if taken up on to the altar, it must be taken down.

(13) I.e., after melikah done improperly the flesh defiles.

(14) Lev. XVII, 15.

(15) Since the melikah was not properly done and does not permit the eating of the sacrifice, the bird is like any other not killed by shechitah, hence nebelah.

(16) Ibid.

(17) The verse quoted is applied to the nebelah of a clean bird. Terefah is not interpreted literally, for reasons stated anon, but as a definition of nebelah, thus: only nebelah similar to Terefah defiles. Now when a bird becomes Terefah, that fact cannot possibly remove any prohibition to which it was subject. Similarly, only a nebelah which cannot remove a prohibition defiles. Now, melikah should render a bird of hullin nebelah, but a consecrated bird is thereby relieved of a prohibition, for whilst alive it could not be offered, whereas after melikah in the sanctuary it can be (i.e., its blood can be sprinkled on the altar, which is the essence of offering). Hence it does not cause the bird to defile garments even when it is improperly done, e.g., at night or with the left hand.

(18) A Mnemonic is a phrase consisting of a string of letters or words, as an aid to the memory. Here K = Kodashim (sacrifices); Z=behuz (without); H=Hullin; F=bifenim (within); Z = behuz.

(19) Since melikah is required for sacrifices, whilst hullin may not be slaughtered within at all, the birds so killed are nebelah!

(20) It is forbidden in both places.

(21) For hullin slaughtered without does not defile even when the shechitah does not permit it. e.g., if the bird is Terefah.

(22) He who slaughters a sacrificial bird without the Temple incurs kareth. This proves that his act does count as shechitah.

(23) It certainly is. Hence the deduction from the word ‘Terefah’ is necessary only in respect of hullin, but not in respect of sacrifices,

(24) Sh. M.: Since shechitah without involves kareth, whilst shechitah within does not, although it actually requires melikah.

(25) For melikah is proper within, but not without.

(26) I.e., you infer shechitah of sacrifices within from shechitah of sacrifices without; similarly, shechitah of hullin within from shechitah of hullin, when same is Terefah, without. In all these cases shechitah does not make the bird permitted.

(27) Viz., from melikah of sacrifices within, which is the proper way.

(28) Lev. VI, 2. V. supra 51a for notes.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Zevachim 69b

R. JUDAH SAID: IT DOES DEFILE IN THE GULLET. SAID R. MEIR: IT IS A KAL WA-HOMER: IF THE SHECHITAH OF AN ANIMAL CLEANSSES IT, EVEN WHEN TEREFAH, FROM ITS UNCLEANNESS, YET WHEN IT IS NEBELAH IT DEFILES THROUGH CONTACT OR CARRIAGE; IS IT NOT LOGICAL THAT SHECHITAH CLEANSSES A BIRD, WHEN TEREFAH FROM ITS UNCLEANNESS, SEEING THAT WHEN IT IS NEBELAH IT DOES NOT DEFILE THROUGH CONTACT OR CARRIAGE?

NOW, AS WE HAVE FOUND THAT SHECHITAH, WHICH MAKES IT [A BIRD OF HULLIN] FIT FOR EATING, CLEANSSES IT WHEN TEREFAH FROM ITS UNCLEANNESS; SO MELIKAH, WHICH MAKES IT [A BIRD SACRIFICE] FIT FOR EATING, CLEANSSES IT WHEN TEREFAH FROM ITS UNCLEANNESS. R. JOSE SAID: IT IS SUFFICIENT FOR IT TO BE LIKE THE NEBELAH OF A CLEAN [PERMITTED] ANIMAL, WHICH IS CLEANSSED BY SHECHITAH, BUT NOT BY MELIKAH.¹

GEMARA. Now, does not R. Meir accept the principle of dayyo [it is sufficient]; Surely the principle of dayyo is biblical? For it was taught: How is a kal wa-homer applied? And the Lord said unto Moses: If her father had but spit in her face, should she not hide in shame seven days?² How much more should a divine reproof necessitate [shame for] fourteen days; but it is sufficient for that which is inferred by an argument to be like the premise!³ —

Said R. Jose son of R. Abin: R. Meir found a text and interpreted it:⁴ This is the law of the beast and of the bird.⁵ Now, in which law is a beast similar to a bird and a bird to a beast? A beast defiles through contact and carriage, whereas a bird does not defile through contact or carriage; a bird defiles garments [when its flesh] is in the gullet, whereas a

beast does not defile garments [when its flesh] is in the gullet. But it is to tell you: as in the case of a beast, that which makes it fit for eating makes it clean when Terefah from its defilement; so in the case of a bird, that which makes it fit for eating⁶ makes it clean when Terefah from its defilement. Then what is R. Judah's reason? —

Said Rabbah, R. Judah found a text, and interpreted it:⁷ [And every soul which eateth] nebelah or terefah [. . . , he shall wash his clothes, etc.].⁹ Said R. Judah: Why is 'Terefah' stated? If 'Terefah' can live, then surely 'nebelah' is already stated;¹⁰ while if 'Terefah' cannot live, it is included in nebelah?¹¹ Hence it is to include a Terefah which one slaughtered, [and teaches] that it defiles. If so, said R. Shisbi to him, when it is written, And the fat [heleb] of nebelah, and the fat of Terefah [may be used for any other service, but ye shall in no wise eat it]:¹² there too let us argue: Why is Terefah stated? If Terefah can live, then surely nebelah is already stated; and if Terefah cannot live, it is included in nebelah? Hence it is to include a Terefah which one slaughtered, [and teaches] that its heleb is clean? Hence it follows that it defiles?¹³ But surely Rab Judah said in Rab's name, whilst others say that it was taught in a Baraitha: And if there die of a beast:¹⁴ some beasts defile, and some beasts do not. And which is it [that is excluded]? A Terefah which was slaughtered! —

Rather, [this is R. Shizbi's difficulty]: This terefah¹⁵ is necessary in order to exclude an unclean animal,¹⁶ [for it intimates:] only that in whose species there is Terefah: hence this [an unclean animal] is excluded, since there is no Terefah in its species.¹⁷ Then here too¹⁸ [say that] [the inclusion of Terefah] excludes an unclean [forbidden] bird, since there is no Terefah in its species?¹⁹ [The exclusion of] an unclean bird is, in R. Judah's opinion, derived from nebelah. For it was taught. R. Judah said: You might think that the nebelah of an unclean bird defiles garments [when its flesh] is in the gullet. Therefore it states, Nebelah or

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Terefah he shall not eat [to defile himself therewith]:²⁰ only that [defiles] whose interdict is on account of ‘do not eat nebelah’; hence this [an unclean bird] is excluded, since its interdict is not on account of ‘do not eat nebelah’, but on account of ‘do not eat unclean’.²¹

- (1) For notes v. supra 50b, 51a.
- (2) Num. XII, 14.
- (3) Since you argue from her father's reproof, even a Divine reproof does not necessitate a longer period of shame. As Scripture proceeds. ‘Let her be shut up without the camp seven days’, it is evident that this principle is Scriptural.
- (4) He accepts the principle of dayyo, but his ruling is based on a text, which makes him disregard the principle in this instance.
- (5) Lev. XI, 46.
- (6) Sc. melikah, in the case of a bird sacrifice.
- (7) Emended text (Sh. M.).
- (8) E.V. that which dieth of itself or that which is torn of beasts. According to the Talmudic interpretation an animal which dies by any method other than the correct ritual one (shechitah) is called nebelah, even if it is ritually slaughtered, but there is a defect in the shechitah. Terefah denotes an animal which was properly slaughtered with shechitah, but was then found to have been suffering from certain diseases or organic disturbances. These are listed in Hul. 42a, where there is a controversy whether a Terefah could have lived (for more than twelve months) or not. On the view that it could, it is regarded as having been alive until the shechitah; on the view that it could not, it is regarded as already dead (technically) even before the shechitah, in which case it is obviously the same as nebelah.
- (9) Lev. XVII, 15.
- (10) So that if the Terefah dies of its disease before it is slaughtered, it is obviously included in nebelah.
- (11) Even whilst alive. So Rashi. Tosaf. and Sh. M. explain differently.
- (12) Ibid. VII, 24. The Talmud (Pes. 23a) interprets this to mean that the heleb of a nebelah is clean and does not defile.
- (13) The Talmud interposes: since R. Shizbi objects thus, it follows that in truth such heleb is unclean and defiles.
- (14) Ibid. XI, 39. Lit. translation. ‘Of’ is partitive, and is understood as a limitation. The verse continues: he that touches the carcass thereof shall be unclean until the evening.
- (15) In the verse which he quotes.

(16) The heleb of an unclean (i.e., forbidden) animal does not defile.

(17) Only the heleb of an animal which can become Terefah defiles. But an unclean animal, which cannot be eaten in any case, can never become Terefah in a technical sense, and therefore its heleb does not defile.

(18) In the verse quoted by R. Judah (the Tanna), not Rab Judah, the Amora.

(19) That is the conclusion of R. Shizbi's objection: Interpret the text thus, and the question returns. What is R. Judah's reason, after R. Meir proves the contrary?

(20) Lev. XXII, 8.

(21) Hence the former verse is left free for the interpretation stated above.

Zevachim 70a

Let this too be derived from, ‘And the fat of nebelah’, [which intimates:] that whose interdict is on account of ‘do not eat the heleb of nebelah’;¹ hence this [the heleb of a forbidden animal] is excluded, since its interdict is not on account of ‘do not eat the heleb of nebelah’, but on account of uncleanness?² —

Rather, this terefah³ is required in order to include hayyah.⁴ I might argue: Only that whose heleb is forbidden whilst its flesh is permitted [is included in this law]; hence a hayyah is excluded, since its heleb and its flesh are permitted.⁵ Therefore [the word Terefah] informs us [that it is not so].⁶ Wherein⁷ does an unclean [forbidden] animal differ?⁸ [presumably] because its heleb is not distinct from its flesh?⁹ but then the heleb of a hayyah is not distinct from its flesh?¹⁰ Moreover, surely it is written, but ye shall in no wise eat it?¹¹ —

Rather, said Abaye. Terefah¹² is needed for its own purpose.¹³ lest you argue: Since an unclean [animal] is forbidden whilst yet alive, and a Terefah is forbidden whilst yet alive:¹⁴ as the heleb of an unclean [animal] is unclean [defiles], so is the heleb of a Terefah unclean.¹⁵ If so, this too¹⁶ is required, lest you say: Since an unclean bird may not be eaten, and a Terefah may not be eaten; as an

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

unclean bird does not defile [garments, when the flesh is in the gullet], so a Terefah too does not defile? Moreover, can Terefah really be derived from an unclean animal:¹⁷ an unclean animal enjoyed no period of fitness,¹⁸ whereas a Terefah enjoyed a period of fitness?¹⁹ And should you answer, what can be said of a Terefah from birth; yet of its kind this can be said.²⁰ —

Rather said Raba: The Torah ordained, Let the interdict of nebelah come and fall upon the interdict of heleb; let the interdict of Terefah come and fall upon the interdict of heleb.²¹ And both are necessary. For if we were informed [this about] nebelah, [I would argue that the reason is] because it defiles;²² but as for Terefah, I would say that it does not [fall upon the interdict of heleb]. And if we were informed [this about] Terefah. [I would say that the reason is] because its interdict dates from when it was alive; but as for nebelah, I would say that it is not so. Hence [they are both] necessary.

Now how does R. Meir employ this [word] terefah?²³ — He needs it to exclude shechitah which is within.²⁴ And R. Judah?²⁵ — Another ‘Terefah’ is written.²⁶ And R. Meir?²⁷ — One excludes shechitah which is within, and the other excludes an unclean forbidden bird. And R. Judah?²⁸ — That is derived from nebelah.²⁹ And R. Meir: how does he employ this ‘nebelah’? — [To show that] the standard of eating [is required], viz., as much as an olive.³⁰ Yet let this be derived from the first text,³¹ since the Divine Law expressed it in terms of eating? — One [text] is employed to show that the standard of eating [is required for defilement], viz., as much as an olive; while the other intimates that this standard of eating must be within the time of eating half [a loaf].³² I might argue, since this is anomalous,³³ let it defile even when it takes more than the time required for eating half [a loaf],³⁴ Hence [the text] informs us [otherwise].

Our Rabbis taught: And the heleb of nebelah, and the heleb of Terefah. [may be used for any other service; but ye shall in no wise eat of it]: Scripture speaks of the heleb of a clean [permitted] animal.³⁵ You say, Scripture speaks of the heleb of a clean animal; yet perhaps it is not so, but rather of the heleb of an unclean animal? You can answer: [Scripture] declared [an animal] clean on account of its being slaughtered, and declared it clean on account of heleb:³⁶ as when it declared it clean on account of being slaughtered, it referred to a clean [permitted], but not an unclean [forbidden] animal;³⁷ so when it declared it clean on account of heleb, it referred to a clean, but not an unclean animal. Or argue in this wise: [Scripture] cleansed from nebelah,³⁸ and it cleansed from heleb:³⁹ as when it cleansed from nebelah, it was in the case of unclean, and not in the case of clean;⁴⁰ so when it cleansed from heleb, [it did so] in the case of unclean, not in the case of clean? Thus you must say,

- (1) Only that heleb does not defile.
- (2) I.e., the whole animal is forbidden.
- (3) In the verse quoted by R. Shizbi.
- (4) A non-domestic animal, e.g., a deer, which may be eaten. The heleb of a hayyah is permitted; that of a behemah (a domestic animal, e.g., a sheep) is forbidden. The discussion hitherto has been about the heleb of a behemah.
- (5) Therefore if a hayyah becomes nebelah, I would think that its heleb defiles, just as its flesh.
- (6) For it teaches that the heleb of whatever is liable to become Terefah, which includes hayyah, does not defile when nebelah.
- (7) ‘Said he to him’ is deleted (Sh. M.).
- (8) That you do not learn from this text that its heleb is clean and does not defile.
- (9) Both are forbidden, and therefore you do not apply this text to it, since that implies that there is a distinction between them.
- (10) Both being permitted. Hence you should not apply it to hayyah either.
- (11) Lev. VII, 24. From this we infer anon that the heleb of a hayyah which is nebelah does defile. Hence the text cannot apply to it.
- (12) In the verse quoted by R. Shizbi.
- (13) To show that the heleb of a Terefah which died is clean.
- (14) In the sense that shechitah cannot permit it.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

- (15) Hence the text teaches otherwise.
- (16) Terefah in the text quoted by R. Judah.
- (17) That you need a text to show that it does not defile.
- (18) Never at any time might it be eaten.
- (19) Before it became Terefah.
- (20) Though that particular Terefah was never fit, Terefah in general was fit at one time.
- (21) The text teaches that when one eats heleb of nebelah or Terefah, he is liable not only on account of heleb but also on account of nebelah or Terefah. For otherwise one might argue: since the interdict of heleb comes first, the other interdicts cannot apply to it at all.
- (22) Which heleb does not. Hence it is logical that the interdict of nebelah, being greater in that respect, falls upon that of heleb.
- (23) In the verse quoted by R. Judah.
- (24) As stated supra 69a.
- (25) How does he know that?
- (26) Terefah is written in Lev. XVII, 15 and XXII, 8. Hence one is used for each.
- (27) How does he utilize this second 'Terefah'?
- (28) Whence does he derive the latter?
- (29) As supra 69b bottom.
- (30) One is not liable for eating nebelah unless he eats at least as much as an olive (this is the general standard for all forbidden food). The text intimates that this too is the smallest quantity which defiles.
- (31) Lev. XVII, 15.
- (32) One is not liable for eating unless he eats as much as an olive within the normal time for eating half a loaf, which is half a meal (Rashi: half a loaf is the size of four average eggs; Maim.: three average eggs). The text teaches that when a man eats the flesh of nebelah (of a bird), he does not defile his garments unless he eats as much as an olive within that time.
- (33) There is no other case in Scripture where an article does not defile through contact, but only when it enters the gullet.
- (34) Being unique in one respect, it might be unique in another.
- (35) Teaching that its heleb does not defile as nebelah.
- (36) Scripture decreed that when an animal is slaughtered (with shechitah) it does not defile; and that the heleb of nebelah does not defile.
- (37) Even if an unclean animal is ritually slaughtered, it defiles.
- (38) There is a case where nebelah does not defile.
- (39) Heleb does not defile, as stated.
- (40) An unclean (forbidden) bird does not defile (as nebelah) when it is in the gullet, whereas a clean bird does.

Zevachim 70b

when you argue in the one way [the text] applies to clean, whilst when you argue in the other way it applies to unclean. Therefore it says, 'Terefah'. [which intimates,] the kind where there is Terefah: then I might exclude the unclean, since there is no Terefah in its kind,¹ but I will not exclude hayyah, since there is Terefah in its kind. Scripture, however, teaches: 'But ye shall in no wise eat of it', [intimating that it refers to] that whose heleb is forbidden whereas its flesh is permitted; thus hayyah is excluded, since its heleb and its flesh are permitted.

R. Jacob b. Abba said to Raba: If so,² is it only the nebelah of a clean animal that defiles, whereas the nebelah of an unclean animal does not defile? — Said he to him: How many elders [scholars] of you have erred therein!³ the second clause⁴ applies to the nebelah of an unclean bird.

R. Johanan said: Only unblemished [birds] did R. Meir declare clean,⁵ but not blemished ones. While R. Eleazar maintained: [He ruled thus] even in the case of blemished ones. It was stated likewise: R. Bibi said in R. Eleazar's name: R. Meir declared blemished [birds] clean, even ducks and fowls.⁶

R. Jeremiah asked: What if one beheaded a goat?⁷ What is the reason in the case of ducks and fowls? [Is it] because they are species of birds; but a goat is not of the same species as a heifer.⁸ Or perhaps, it is of the species of cattle?⁹ R. Dimi sat and recited this discussion. Said Abaye to him: Hence it follows that the beheaded heifer¹⁰ is clean? — Yes, he replied: the School of R. Jannai said: 'Forgiveness'¹¹ is written in connection therewith, as in the case of sacrifices.¹²

R. Nathan the father of R. Huna objected: 'But ye shall in no wise eat of it': I know [this law only of] heleb which may not be eaten but may be [otherwise] used.¹³ How do we know

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

[it of] the heleb of the ox that is stoned¹⁴ and the beheaded heifer? — Because it says, All heleb [... ye shall not eat].¹⁵ But if you think that the beheaded heifer is clean, could it be clean while its heleb is unclean?¹⁶ Where one did indeed behead it, no text is required; it is required only where one slaughtered it.¹⁷ Then let shechitah be efficacious in cleansing it from nebelah?¹⁸ — The text is necessary only where it died.¹⁹ Hence it follows that it was forbidden whilst yet alive?²⁰ — Yes. R. Jannai observed: I have heard a time limit for it,²¹ but have forgotten it; while our colleagues maintain: Its descent to the rugged valley, that renders it forbidden.

CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. ALL SACRIFICES WHICH BECAME MIXED UP WITH SIN-OFFERINGS THAT MUST BE LEFT TO DIE,²² OR WITH AN OX THAT IS TO BE STONED,²³ EVEN ONE IN TEN THOUSAND, ALL MUST BE LEFT TO DIE. IF THEY WERE MIXED UP WITH AN OX WITH WHICH TRANSGRESSION HAD BEEN COMMITTED, e.g.²⁴,

- (1) There is no particular interdict of Terefah since it is forbidden in any case.
- (2) If you argue, 'as when it cleansed from nebelah it was in the case of unclean and not in the case of clean', which implies that the nebelah of a forbidden animal is clean.
- (3) I am astonished that you (and presumably, your colleagues in the Academy — perhaps R. Jacob spoke on their behalf) — should so err.
- (4) That to which he referred.
- (5) After melikah, if they are Terefah. The reason is because melikah is applicable to them.
- (6) Which are not eligible sacrifices at all. For Terefah too is not fit and yet R. Meir declares it clean.
- (7) V. Deut. XXI, 1-9. Beheading' instead of shechitah normally renders an animal nebelah, so that it defiles, but since it was prescribed for the heifer, it presumably does not defile. What, however, if he beheaded a goat instead of a heifer, and for the same purpose: is the goat nebelah or not?
- (8) Hence it will defile. — A heifer is counted amongst the large cattle, while a goat belongs to the small; therefore they are regarded as different species.

- (9) Behemah; v. p. 342, n. 9.
- (10) V. Deut. XXI, 1 ff.
- (11) Ibid. 8.
- (12) Hence it is treated as such, and does not defile.
- (13) As Scripture states, may be used for any other service. Only such heleb does not defile.
- (14) V. Ex. XXI, 28f. All benefit of the ox was forbidden.
- (15) Lev. VII, 23. This ref. adopts Sh. M.'s emendation of Rashi, and is the preceding verse. The marginal ref. is Lev. III, 17, which seems out of place. — 'All' is an extension and includes the heleb of these.
- (16) Obviously not, and no verse would be necessary to teach it.
- (17) After becoming forbidden whilst alive through being set aside for this purpose, it was slaughtered (with shechitah) instead of beheaded. Then a text is required to show that its heleb does not defile.
- (18) Though shechitah will not permit it, at least it should free it from defilement, since we find no instance of a slaughtered and clean (permitted) animal defiling.
- (19) This retracts the preceding answer. It had died of itself before it was beheaded. Here its flesh does defile as nebelah, and the text teaches that its heleb does not defile.
- (20) Since the question is asked in respect of a heifer which died, it follows that even before it was beheaded, whilst yet alive, all benefit thereof was forbidden, and that is why the question is asked concerning the heleb.
- (21) When it becomes forbidden.
- (22) I.e., which for some reason can neither be offered up nor revert to hullin, so that they must not be put to work, but must be kept until they die. They are as follows: (i) The young of a sin-offering which calved before it was slaughtered.
- (ii) One whose owner died. (iii) The substitute of a sin-offering (v. p. 22, n. 8). (iv) A sin-offering whose owner had already made atonement. E.g., it was lost, whereupon he dedicated another and sacrificed it, and then the original one was found. And (v) an animal consecrated before it was a year old, but which passed its first year before being sacrificed (Rashi, as marginally emended). In cur. edd. Rashi enumerates an animal found to be blemished after consecration as the fifth.
- (23) V. Ex. XXI, 28.
- (24) Lit., 'or'.

Zevachim 71a

THAT HAD KILLED A MAN ON THE TESTIMONY OF ONE WITNESS OR OF ITS OWNER;¹ A ROBA OR A NIRBA';² OR AN ANIMAL SET ASIDE [FOR AN IDOLATROUS

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

SACRIFICE] OR THAT HAD BEEN WORSHIPPED [AS AN IDOL]; OR THAT WAS [A HARLOT'S] HIRE, OR [A DOG'S] EXCHANGE;

(1) So that it cannot be stoned.

(2) Animals used bestially: roba', a male with a woman, nirba', a female with a man.

Zevachim 71b

OR THAT WAS KILAYIM;¹ OR TEREFAH; OR AN ANIMAL CALVED THROUGH THE CAESAREAN SECTION,² THEY MUST GRAZE UNTIL THEY BECOME UNFIT;³ THEN THEY ARE SOLD, AND ONE BRINGS [A SACRIFICE] OF THE SAME KIND⁴ AT THE PRICE OF THE BETTER OF THEM.⁵ IF THEY WERE MIXED UP WITH UNBLEMISHED [ANIMALS] OF HULLIN,⁶ THE HULLIN MUST BE SOLD FOR THE PURPOSE OF THAT KIND.⁷

[IF] A SACRIFICE [WAS MIXED UP] WITH A SACRIFICE, BOTH BEING OF THE SAME KIND:⁸ THIS ONE MUST BE OFFERED IN THE NAME OF WHOEVER IS ITS OWNER, AND THE OTHER MUST BE OFFERED IN THE NAME OF WHOEVER IS ITS OWNER.⁹ [IF] A SACRIFICE [WAS MIXED UP] WITH A SACRIFICE, BOTH BEING OF DIFFERENT KINDS,¹⁰ THEY MUST GRAZE UNTIL THEY BECOME UNFIT,¹¹ AND THEN ONE PURCHASES AT THE PRICE OF THE BETTER OF THEM [AN ANIMAL] OF EACH KIND,¹² AND BEARS THE LOSS OF THE EXCESS OUT OF HIS OWN POCKET.¹³ IF THEY WERE MIXED UP WITH A FIRSTLING OR TITHE, THEY MUST GRAZE UNTIL THEY BECOME UNFIT, AND THEN ARE EATEN AS FIRSTLING OR TITHE.¹⁴ ALL [SACRIFICES] CAN BE MIXED UP, EXCEPT THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE GUILT-OFFERING.¹⁵

GEMARA. What does EVEN mean?¹⁶ — This is what he means: ALL SACRIFICES with which SIN-OFFERINGS THAT MUST BE LEFT TO DIE, E.G., AN OX THAT MUST BE STONED, BECAME MIXED UP, EVEN ONE IN TEN THOUSAND, MUST BE LEFT

TO DIE.¹⁷ [But] we have already learnt it once: All which are forbidden to the altar, e.g., a roba' and a nirba', render [others] forbidden whatever their number?¹⁸ —

Said R. Kahana: I reported this discussion to R. Shimi b. Ashi, and he said to me: They are both necessary.¹⁹ For if [we learnt] from there, I would say. That is only [where they are forbidden] to the altar;²⁰ but [where they are forbidden] to a layman, it is not [so].²¹ While if [we learnt] from here, I would say that [this ruling applies] only to these, which are forbidden for any use; but as for the others, which are not forbidden for general use, it is not [so].²² Thus they are both necessary. But surely those which are not interdicted for all use are taught [in this Mishnah]?²³ — Does he teach by what number [they render all forbidden]?²⁴ Then let him teach the other, and we would not require this one? — He needs the remedy.²⁵ But [those which are forbidden] to layman he also teaches; [there:] The following are themselves forbidden, and render [others] forbidden, whatever their number: Wine of nesek²⁶ and [animals of] idolatry?²⁷

(1) A hybrid, offspring of two heterogeneous animals, e.g., a goat and a sheep.

(2) These last two are included, though not implicated in sin, because the same law applies to them.

(3) I.e., blemished.

(4) As that which had thus been mixed up.

(5) None of these are eligible for sacrifices, yet a layman may make use of (though not eat) them; therefore they are not left to perish. At present, however, these animals cannot be used, since one of them is sacred, nor can they be redeemed (i.e., sold, and the money devoted to a sacrifice), for an unblemished consecrated animal cannot be redeemed. Hence they must be allowed to graze until they receive a blemish, when they are sold, etc.

(6) One consecrated animal with either one or many of hullin.

(7) E.g., an animal consecrated for a peace-offering was mixed up with five of hullin, five of the six must be sold to people who owe a peace-offering. Thus all the six are now sacred and stand for the same purpose.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(8) E.g., both are peace-offerings or burnt-offerings, but belong to different owners.

(9) Rashi: the priest who offers it must declare, 'Lo, this is for the sake of its owner', without specifying a name. Tosaf, and Sh. M.: the priest says nothing at all about its owner, and then it is tacitly understood to be for its owner, whoever he is.

(10) E.g., a burnt-offering with a peace-offering.

(11) They cannot be offered themselves, because their rites of sprinkling and presenting the emurim are dissimilar.

(12) One for each sacrifice.

(13) The two animals, each of the value of the better of the first two, naturally involve a loss.

(14) The animals are redeemed, and other sacrifices bought with the redemption money. All those which were mixed up are eaten as firstling or tithe, i.e., they are subject to the same laws as these when blemished, which is that they must not be slaughtered in the public abattoirs (market) nor sold by weight.

(15) Because they are distinct, as explained in the Gemara.

(16) EVEN ONE IN TEN THOUSAND implies that the unfit are in the majority. But in that case it is all the more obvious that they cannot be sacrificed.

(17) This reverses the numbers.

(18) I.e., the smallest number of forbidden animals disqualify even the largest number with which they are mixed up. v. Tem. 28a. That is the same as our Mishnah.

(19) Emended text (Sh. M.).

(20) Lit., 'to the All-high'.

(21) All those enumerated there are forbidden to the altar but not for general use, and so they can (and must) be redeemed. Here, however, they are completely forbidden, and cannot be redeemed. I would say therefore that we cannot be so strict as to rule that all must die, but that on the contrary the one (or few) is annulled by the many, and all are permitted. Hence the Mishnah informs us otherwise.

(22) This reverses the preceding argument. I would argue that we are stricter here, precisely because the interdict is greater.

(23) Sc. in the clause, IF THEY BECAME MIXED UP WITH AN OX, etc. These are only forbidden as sacrifices, but not for general use.

(24) EVEN ONE IN TEN THOUSAND may apply only to what precedes, but not to what follows. Hence the other Mishnah is necessary.

(25) The other Mishnah only states that they cannot be sacrificed. Here he teaches what is to be done with them.

(26) V. Glos.

(27) If wine of Nesek is mixed with other permitted wine, or animals which had been worshiped are mixed up with others, they are all forbidden for any use whatever.

Zevachim 72a

They are both necessary: for if [I learnt] from there, I would say. That applies only to hullin; but as for sacrifices, Let us not cause the loss of all of them.¹ While if [I learnt] from here, I would say. This applies only to sacred animals, because it is repulsive;² but as for hullin, where it is not repulsive, I would say that though they are forbidden for any use, let them be annulled by the majority. Thus [both] are necessary.

Now, let them indeed be annulled by the majority? And should you answer, They are important and cannot be annulled; that is well on the view that we learnt 'whatever one is wont to count'; but on the view that we learnt 'that which one is wont to count what can be said'?³ For we learnt: If a man has bundles of fenugreek of kil'ayim⁴ of a vineyard,⁵

(1) Since they are of greater (religious) value, let the forbidden animals be annulled by the larger number of consecrated ones.

(2) The slightest possibility of sacrificing a forbidden animal, though it be one in a thousand, is repulsive. Therefore they are all forbidden.

(3) This is explained anon.

(4) V. Glos.

(5) Cf. Lev. XIX, 19 and Deut. XXII, 9.

Zevachim 72b

they must be burnt.¹ If they were mixed up with others,² and those again with others,³ they must all be burnt: that is the view of R. Meir. But the Sages maintain: They are neutralized in a mixture of two hundred to one. For R. Meir used to say: Whatever one is wont to count renders [others] forbidden;⁴ while the Sages maintain: Only six things forbid [the whole] — R. Akiba says: Seven — and they are as follows: The nuts of Perek,

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

the pomegranates of Badan,⁵ sealed casks [of wine], beetroot tops, cabbage stalks,⁶ and Grecian gourds. R. Akiba adds the loaves of a householder.⁷ Those which are subject to the law of 'orlah⁸ [render the mixture] 'orlah;⁹ and those which are subject to the law of kil'ayim of the vineyard, [render the mixture] kil'ayim of the vineyard.

Now it was stated thereon: R. Johanan said: We learnt,¹⁰ That which one is wont to count;¹¹ while Resh Lakish said: We learnt, Whatever one is wont to count.¹² Now, it is well according to Resh Lakish;¹³ but according to R. Johanan, what can be said?¹⁴ — Said R. Papa: This Tanna¹⁵ is the Tanna who taught [the Baraita] concerning the litra of dried figs, who maintained:

(1) For they must not be used in any way. Burning is deduced from the word *tikdash* (E.V. forfeited) in the latter text, which is read *tukad esh*, 'shall be burnt in fire'.

(2) Permitted bundles of the same.

(3) This clause is omitted in 'Orlah III, 6 and Yeb. 81b.

(4) Lit., consecrated.'

(5) Perek and Badan are towns in Samaria N.E. of Shechem. In Yeb. 81b s.v. *פרך* Tosaf. renders the former by crack-nuts.

(6) Beverages were made from these two.

(7) In connection with the neutralizing of leavened mixed up with unleavened bread before Passover, when the latter is required for the festival. All these were considered of particular importance, and could not be neutralized. In the last-mentioned a distinction is drawn between home-made loaves and the loaves of a baker, the latter being less important.

(8) V. Glos. They are the nuts, pomegranates and sealed casks of wine (made of grapes of 'orlah).

(9) The whole comes under the law of 'orlah.

(10) In R. Meir's ruling.

(11) Only such objects which are always counted cannot be neutralized, but not objects which are sometimes counted and sometimes sold in bulk.

(12) Even only occasionally. For further notes v. Yeb. (Sonc. ed.) 81b.

(13) For animals are sometimes sold singly and sometimes in lots (uncounted save by a general estimate).

(14) Let them indeed be neutralized.

(15) Of our Mishnah, and the Mishnah cited in the text.

Zevachim 73a

Whatsoever is numbered [in selling], even [if its prohibition is] Rabbinical, cannot be neutralized, and how much the more when it is Biblical!¹ For it was taught: If a litra of dried figs² was pressed on the top of a round jar, and he does not know in which jar it was pressed; or on the top of a cask, and he does not know in which cask; or on top of a 'beehive',³ and he does not know in which, R. Meir maintains that R. Eliezer said: We regard the upper [layers] as if they are separated, and the lower ones neutralize the upper ones;⁴ while R. Joshua ruled: If there were a hundred tops, they neutralize; if not, [all] the tops are forbidden, and the bottom layers⁵ are permitted.⁶

R. Judah maintained: R. Eliezer said: If there were a hundred tops, they neutralize; if not, [all] the tops are forbidden, etc.; while R. Joshua ruled: Even if you have three hundred tops, they do not neutralize.⁷ If he pressed it in a round jar, and he does not know in which part of the jar he pressed it, whether in the north or in the south, all agree that it is neutralized.⁹ R. Ashi said: You may even say [that it agrees with] the Rabbis: Living creatures are important, and cannot be neutralized. Now, let us detach [them] one by one and say, whatever is detached,¹⁰ is detached from the majority?¹¹ [You say,] 'detach [them]!' but that is *kabua*'

(1) As in the instances which we are discussing.

(2) Of *terumah* (q.v. Glos.), which may not be eaten by a Zar. Normally it is neutralized by one hundred times its quantity. By Biblical law *terumah* must be given only of corn, wine, and oil (v. Num. XVIII, 8; Deut. XVIII, 4); the Rabbis added fruit.

(3) A receptacle of that shape.

(4) Though only the top layer of each cask, etc. is in doubt, for the bottom ones are certainly not *terumah*, we regard the top layers as if they were taken away from their place and dispersed among all the layers of all the casks. Hence, if there are a hundred layers in all against the one in doubt, it is neutralized and all are permitted.

(5) I.e., all but the top one.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(6) But you cannot count all the layers for neutralizing purposes, since they are not in doubt.

(7) For layers of figs are sold by number.

(8) The litra of figs.

(9) Because it may not be a complete layer, and is therefore not sold by number. — Hence our Mishnah agrees with R. Joshua. For further notes v. Bez. (Sonc. ed.) 3bff.

(10) Lit., ‘separates’.

(11) This is a general rule: when one thing is detached from many, we assume that it was detached from what constituted the majority. Here the majority of the animals are fit for sacrifice; as we detach each one, we may assume that it was of the majority, and therefore it can be sacrificed. Only the last two will then remain forbidden.

Zevachim 73b

and every [case of] kabua' is like half and half?¹ — Rather, [the difficulty is this]: Let us force them to scatter and then say, whatever is detached, is detached from the majority? — Said Raba: We fear lest [e.g.] ten priests come at the same time and offer them.² One of the Rabbis observed to Raba: If so, is the tray forbidden?³ — [Rather the reason is] because [we fear] lest [e.g.] ten priests come and take them simultaneously.⁴ Is that possible?⁵ — Rather said Raba: The reason is because of kabua'.⁶ Raba said: Since the Rabbis ruled that we must not offer them, if one does offer, it [each animal]

does not propitiate.⁷ R. Huna b. Judah raised an objection to Raba: If a sin-offering was mixed up with a burnt-offering, or a burnt-offering with a sin-offering,⁸ even one in ten thousand, all must die.⁹ When is this? If the priest consulted [the authorities].¹⁰ But if the priest did not consult [the authorities], and he sacrificed them [all] above,¹¹ half are fit and half are unfit;¹² below, half are fit and half are unfit. [If he sacrificed] one above and one below, both are unfit, for I assume [that] the sin-offering was offered above, and the burnt-offering below!¹³ — Said he to him:¹⁴ This [my ruling] is in accordance with the view that live animals can be [permanently] rejected; the other is in accordance with the view that live animals cannot be [permanently] rejected.¹⁵ But what about

slaughtered animals regarding which all agree that they are [permanently] rejected,

(1) This is a general rule in the Talmud: although the majority is always followed, that is only when the minority is not kabua', fixed, settled in a certain place; otherwise it is equal to the majority; v. Sanh. (Sonc. ed.) p. 531, n. 4. Here, the forbidden animal being kabua', is therefore equal to the majority.

(2) This is now assumed to mean that after they are detached and slaughtered one after the other, ten priests will sprinkle the blood of ten animals or present their emurim (these are the essential acts of offering) simultaneously. Now, where e.g. the ten constitute the majority, they may therefore be assumed to include the forbidden one.

(3) After each animal has been slaughtered in the presumption that it is permitted, can they now become forbidden when their emurim are on the tray, waiting to be presented at the altar? That is absurd.

(4) From the confused herd.

(5) Surely not. Since they are scattered, it is impossible for the priests to take them at the identical moment.

(6) If we permit this when they are scattered, the priests may come and take them one by one even when they are not scattered, which, as stated above, is forbidden.

(7) This is a technical expression to denote that the sacrifice is invalid, and the owner still remains liable to his obligation.

(8) This refers to birds. These cannot be left until they are blemished, as bird-offerings cannot be redeemed.

(9) Since we do not know now how each is to be sacrificed.

(10) He asked what he was to do.

(11) As burnt-offerings.

(12) And if there was one bird of each, he must bring another for a sin-offering; similarly when it is reversed.

(13) I.e., this is possible; v. Kin. I, 2 and III, 1. — Thus although the priest is forbidden to offer them in the first place, yet if he does, those offered properly are fit. The same then should apply here.

(14) Marginal emendation.

(15) v. p. 295, n. 7, 10.

Zevachim 74a

yet we learnt, R. Eliezer said: If he offered the head of one of them, all the heads must be offered?¹ — He ruled in accordance with

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Hanan the Egyptian. For it was taught: Hanan the Egyptian said: Even if the blood is in the cup, he brings its companion and pairs it.²

R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha [in Rab's name]:³ If a ring of idolatry⁴ was mixed up with a hundred rings, and one of them fell into the Great Sea,⁵ all are permitted, because we say: The one which fell was the one which was forbidden.⁶ Raba raised an objection to R. Nahman: **EVEN ONE IN TEN THOUSAND, ALL MUST BE LEFT TO DIE.** Yet why so; let us say that the first which dies is the forbidden one? Said he to him: Rab ruled in accordance with R. Eliezer, for we learnt: R. Eliezer said: if he offered the head of one of them, all the heads may be offered.⁷ But surely R. Eleazars said: R. Eliezer permitted [them to be offered] only in twos,⁹ but not singly? — I also meant in twos,¹⁰ he replied.

Rab said:¹¹ If a ring of idolatry was mixed up with a hundred rings, and forty of them [were] detached to one place, and sixty to another: if one [was] detached from the forty, it does not forbid [others];¹² if one [was detached] from the sixty, it renders [others] forbidden. Why is one from forty different? [presumably] because we say, The forbidden [article] is among the majority? Then [in the case of] one from sixty too we must say, The forbidden [article] is in the majority?¹³ Rather [this is what he said]: If the forty were all separated to one place, they do not render [others] forbidden;¹⁴ [if] sixty [were detached] to one place, they render [others] forbidden.¹⁵ When I stated this before Samuel, he said to me: Leave idolatry alone, for a doubt therein and a double doubt are forbidden for all time.¹⁶ An objection is raised: The doubt of idolatry is forbidden, but a double doubt is permitted. How so? If a goblet of idolatry fell into a storeroom filled with goblets, all are forbidden. If one of these was detached and mixed up with ten thousand, and from the ten

thousand [one was detached into] ten thousand, they are permitted?¹⁷ —

It is a controversy of Tannaim. For it was taught, R. Judah said: pomegranates of Badan, however small their proportion, render [others] forbidden. How so? If one of them fell into ten thousand, and [one] of the ten thousand into [another] ten thousand, all are forbidden. R. Simeon b. Judah said on R. Simeon's authority: [If it fell] into ten thousand, they are forbidden; but [if one] of the ten thousand [fell] into three, and [one] of the three [fell] among others,¹⁸ they are permitted .¹⁹

In accordance with whom did Samuel rule? If in accordance with R. Judah, it is forbidden even in the case of other interdicts?²⁰ If in accordance with R. Simeon, then even in the case of idolatry too [a double doubt] is permitted? And should you say, R. Simeon allows a distinction between idolatry and other interdicts; then when it was taught, 'A doubt of idolatry is forbidden, but a double doubt is permitted,' who is its author? it is neither R. Judah nor R. Simeon? —

In truth [the author of this is] R. Simeon, and he permits in the case of idolatry too,²¹ while Samuel agrees with R. Judah in one matter, but disagrees in another.²² The master said: '[If one] of the ten thousand [fell] into three, and [one]' of the three [fell] among others, they are permitted.'

(1) V. infra 77b. Though had the priest asked, we would have instructed him not to offer any.

(2) V. supra 34b.

(3) Sh. M. deletes 'in Rab's name'.

(4) One which adorned an idol; all benefit thereof is forbidden, and it is not neutralized when it is mixed up with any number of others, all of which become forbidden (supra 71b).

(5) Probably the Mediterranean. Of course, the same applies, to any place where it is lost.

(6) We make this lenient assumption.

(7) Thus the first is assumed to have been the forbidden one.

(8) The Amora.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(9) Where one is definitely not forbidden, and so we assume the same about the other.

(10) The remaining rings must be sold in twos.

(11) Marginal emendation: Rab Judah said in Rab's name.

(12) If it became mixed up with others. 'Separated' in the whole passage means accidentally.

(13) I.e., the remaining fifty nine.

(14) If these forty were mixed up with others, because we assume that the forbidden one is in the sixty. If they were not mixed up with others, they would remain forbidden, for the forbidden ring cannot be nullified in the majority, and even R. Eliezer permits a lenient assumption only where an article is lost or destroyed, as where the head of one of them is offered. Nevertheless, when the forty are mixed up with others, all are permitted, because now there is a double doubt concerning each ring: Firstly, the forty may not have contained the forbidden one at all; and secondly, even if they did, each one of the present mixed group may not be of the forty. Hence they are all permitted.

(15) Because we assume that the forbidden one is in the majority, and so now there is only a single doubt concerning each ring: whether it is the forbidden one or not. Therefore we must adopt a rigorous ruling.

(16) No matter how slight the doubt, it is always forbidden. Thus even in the case of forty they render others forbidden.

(17) This contradicts Samuel. — It is not clear why this second clause, 'and from the ten thousand into ten thousand' is necessary, for since a double doubt is permitted, when one of the storeroom is mixed up with the first ten thousand, the latter should be permitted. Sh. M. suggests that the first ten thousand are permitted, but they may not be all used simultaneously, for then we have only a single doubt, whether the one from the storeroom was the goblet of idolatry or not. (He rejects the explanation, given by Tosaf. in the next passage, that the second ten thousand is mentioned to show that he who forbids, forbids even then, as inapplicable here since no view forbidding these is expressed in this Baraitha at all. Nevertheless, it is possible that the Baraitha is a fragment, the other half being lost even in Talmudic times, and so the Talmud cites it as a refutation of Samuel.)

(18) Lit., 'into another place'.

(19) Rashi: both the first three and the others, because there is a double doubt in connection with both. Tosaf.: the first three may not all be enjoyed simultaneously (v. n. 2.). The number three is discussed anon.

(20) Since R. Judah's ruling does not refer particularly to idolatry.

(21) Emended text (Sh. M.).

(22) He agrees that a double doubt of idolatry is forbidden, but does not apply it to other interdicts, as does R. Judah.

Zevachim 74b

Why are three different? [presumably] because there is a majority? Then [if it fell] among two, there is also a majority? — What does he mean by 'three'? two together with itself. Alternatively, he agrees with R. Eliezer.¹

Resh Lakish said: If a cask of terumah was mixed up with a hundred casks [of hullin], and one of them fell into the Salt Sea,² all of them become permitted, for we assume: The one which fell was the forbidden one.³ Now, the rulings of both R. Nahman⁴ and Resh Lakish are necessary. For if [we learnt] from R. Nahman's [ruling], I would say: It applies to idolatry only, because it has no remedy to permit it;⁵ but in the case of terumah, which has a remedy,⁶ I would say that it is not so.⁷ While if [we learnt] from Resh Lakish, I would say: It applies only to a cask, whose fall is noticeable; but as for a ring, whose fall [loss] is not noticeable, I would say that it is not so.⁸ Thus they are both necessary.

Rabbah said: Resh Lakish permitted only a cask, whose fall is noticeable, but not a fig.⁹ But R. Joseph said: Even a fig: as its fall, so its removal [rise].¹⁰

R. Eleazar said: If a [closed] cask of terumah fell among a hundred casks, he opens one of them, removes therefrom the proportion of the mixture,¹¹ and drinks [the rest]. R. Dimi sat and reported this ruling. Said R. Nahman to him: We see here quaffing and drinking!¹² Say rather: If one of them was opened,¹³ he removes thereof the proportion of the mixture, and drinks.

R. Oshaia said: If a [sealed] cask of terumah was mixed up with a hundred and fifty casks, and a hundred of them were opened [accidentally], he removes from them the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

proportion of the mixture and drinks, but the rest are forbidden until they are opened [accidentally], [for] we do not say, The forbidden article is in the majority.¹⁴

A ROBA' OR A NIRBA', etc. As for all the others, it is well; [for their disqualification] is not perceptible;¹⁵ but how is this [case of] Terefah possible? if it is perceptible, let [the priest] come and remove it?¹⁶ whilst if he cannot distinguish it, how does he know that [a Terefah] was mixed up?¹⁷

The school of R. Jannai said: The circumstances here are e.g., that [an animal] perforated by a thorn was mixed up with one attacked by a wolf.¹⁸ Resh Lakish said: It was mixed up e.g. with a fallen animal. [You say,] 'A fallen animal'? that too can be examined?¹⁹ He holds [that] if it, stood up, it needs [observation for] twenty-four hours; if it walked, it needs examination.²⁰ R. Jeremiah said: E.g., it was mixed up with the young of a Terefah, this being in accordance with R. Eliezer, who maintained: The young of a Terefah cannot be offered at the altar. All these [Rabbis] did not explain it as the school of R. Jannai, [because they hold that] you can distinguish [an animal] perforated by a thorn from one attacked by a wolf, [as the perforation of] the former is elongated, whereas [that of] the latter is round. They did not explain it as Resh Lakish, [for] they hold: If it arose, it does not need twenty-four hours; if it walked, it does not need examination. They did not explain it as R. Jeremiah, because they would not make it agree with R. Eliezer.²¹

[IF] A SACRIFICE [WAS MIXED UP] WITH A SACRIFICE, BOTH BEING OF THE SAME KIND, etc. But [the sacrifice] requires laying on [of hands]?²² — Said R. Joseph: It refers to sacrifices of women.²³ But not to men's sacrifices?

(1) V. supra a, where it is stated that R. Eliezer permits the heads to be offered only in twos. Similarly here, the pomegranates can be used only

in twos, and for that reason it must have fallen into at least three, so that there are four in all; otherwise, two could be used, while the third would be forbidden. (Rashi gives two explanations: this is the second, which is adopted by Tosaf. too, though Rashi favors the first.)

(2) The Dead Sea.

(3) Sc. that of terumah.

(4) V. supra a: he gives a similar ruling on a ring of idolatry.

(5) In itself; hence it would be too rigorous to say that they remain forbidden.

(6) The lot can be sold to a priest, to whom it is permitted.

(7) There is no need for this lenient assumption.

(8) A cask is a large object, and its loss is noticeable. Hence when the rest are permitted, one can see that it is because one fell out. But a ring is small and its loss out of a large number is not noticeable. Therefore it might be thought that if the rest are permitted, one will not know the reason and believe that they are all permitted, even if none fell out.

(9) Which is small. — Sh. M.: This is only if the fig was mixed up with less than a hundred, as otherwise it is neutralized in any case. But a closed cask is not neutralized by any number (supra 72b.).

(10) Just as you consider it sufficiently important to render all forbidden when it falls among other figs, so must its removal be considered sufficiently noticeable to render them all permitted.

(11) One cask is forbidden, while a hundred are permitted; hence the proportion of the forbidden is 1/101st part; this he must remove, and the rest is permitted, for an open cask can be neutralized (Sh. M. reads in Rashi: he must remove 1/100th part, not 1/101st part).

(12) If he is permitted to open the cask, how is this law, that a sealed cask can never be neutralized, possible?

(13) Accidentally.

(14) As Rab supra a. If we did say thus, we would assume the cask of terumah to be in the hundred, so that the other fifty are immediately permitted.

(15) Lit., 'known'. Hence they can be mixed up with others.

(16) From the other animals. — It is perceptible when it is an outward form of Terefah, e.g., if the skull was perforated. But then it is distinguishable from the other animals.

(17) If it is an internal form of Terefah, so that it is not distinguishable from the others, how indeed does he know that it is Terefah until it is slaughtered and examined?

(18) Both show marks of perforation, and so are indistinguishable; but the former is not Terefah (unless the thorn penetrated right through the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

flesh into the interior of the animal, which it did not here), whereas the latter is (any animal attacked by a beast of prey is Terefah).

(19) If it can get up and walk, it is entirely fit, as there is an opinion that in such a case one need not wait but can slaughter it immediately, and it need not even be examined after slaughter to see if there is a lesion of the vital organs, which would render it Terefah. Hence it is merely necessary in the present instance to see which animals can walk.

(20) If the animal merely succeeded in rising, but could not walk, it must be kept to see if it can live twenty-four hours; if it is slaughtered before, it is Terefah even if no internal lesion is discovered. But if it succeeded in walking, it can be slaughtered at any time, save that after slaughtering all the vital organs, e.g., the spinal cord, lungs, heart, etc., must be examined for injury (this is not required in the case of an ordinary animal); thus it is considered as a doubtful Terefah and may not be offered. In this instance all the animals can walk, yet as there remains the doubt, none can be offered.

(21) His ruling is generally rejected, v. Shab. 130b, (Sonc. ed.) p. 653, n. 9.

(22) By its owner, whereas he is unknown.

(23) Which did not require it.

Zevachim 75a

Abaye raised an objection to him: If an individual's sacrifice was mixed up with an individual's sacrifice, or a congregational sacrifice with a congregational sacrifice, or if an individual's sacrifice and a congregational sacrifice were mixed up, [the priest] must make four applications [of the blood] of each [sacrifice];¹ Yet if he made an application of each, he has fulfilled his obligation;² and if he made four applications from all,³ it suffices. When is this said?⁴ If they were mixed up alive; but if they were mixed up after being slaughtered,⁵ he makes four applications for all of them; yet if he made one application, he fulfilled his duty. Rabbi said: We examine the application: if it contains sufficient for each,⁶ it is fit; if not, it is unfit. Now, he teaches about an individual who is similar to the congregation: as the congregation [consists of] men, so the individual [means] a man!⁷ —

Said Raba: And is it reasonable that this is correct [as it stands]? [Surely not,] for he

teaches: When is this said? if they were mixed up alive; but not if they were mixed up when slaughtered. But what does it matter whether they are alive or slaughtered?⁸ Rather, this is what he means: when is this said? If they were mixed up, when slaughtered, as if they were alive, [viz.,] the goblets [were mixed up]; but where one mingled [the blood in one goblet], [the priest] makes four applications for all of them; yet if he made one application on behalf of all, he has fulfilled his duty.⁹

‘Rabbi said: We examine the application: if it contains sufficient for each, it is fit; if not, it is unfit.’ Now does Rabbi hold this view? Surely it was taught: Rabbi said: According to R. Eliezer,

(1) Cf. supra 52b.

(2) Cf. supra 36a: whatever is sprinkled on the outer altar, if the priest made one application thereof, he has atoned.

(3) Rashi: two for each sacrifice, i.e., four from one sacrifice, so that it can be regarded as two for each; similarly according to the explanations of Tosaf. and Sh. M.: this means where four sacrifices were mixed up, an individual's with an individual's and a congregational one with a congregational one, so that he makes one for each sacrifice. Sh. M. regards this as forced, and proposes an emendation: ‘and if he made two applications etc’.

(4) That in the first place four applications of each are necessary.

(5) So that their blood was mixed in one goblet.

(6) If he applied enough blood in this one application for two.

(7) Not only a woman.

(8) Even if they are slaughtered they may still require four applications from each, e.g., if the goblets were mixed up, but all the blood was not in one goblet.

(9) Hence the passage refers to slaughtered animals, laying of hands having already taken place before they were mixed up.

Zevachim 75b

sprinkling, no matter how little, cleanses; sprinkling does not require a definite standard; sprinkling [is valid even if the mixture is] half fit and half unfit?¹ — He states [the law] according to R. Eliezer.² Alternatively, sprinkling [upon a person] is

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

one thing, while a [blood] application is another.³

IF THEY WERE MIXED UP WITH A FIRSTLING OR TITHE, etc. Rami b. Hama said: According to Beth Shammai, a firstling may not be given as food to menstruant women;⁴ what about its substitute?⁵ A firstling cannot be redeemed;⁶ what about its substitute? A firstling cannot be weighed by the pound;⁷ what about its substitute? — Said Raba: It was taught: A firstling and tithe, [even] when they became blemished, effect substitution.⁸ and their substitute is like themselves.⁹

Rami b. Hama asked: If one dedicated a [blemished] firstling for the Temple repair,¹⁰ can it be weighed by the pound?¹¹ Is the profit of hekdes¹² of greater consideration, or is the degradation of the firstling¹³ of greater consideration? —

Said R. Jose b. Zebida, Come and hear: **IF THEY WERE MIXED UP WITH A FIRSTLING OR TITHE, THEY MUST GRAZE UNTIL THEY BECOME UNFIT, AND THEN THEY ARE EATEN AS FIRSTLING OR TITHE.** Surely that means that they are not weighed by the pound?¹⁴ — R. Huna and R. Hezekiah, disciples of R. Jeremiah, said: How compare? There you have two sanctities and two bodies,¹⁵ but here you have two sanctities¹⁶ and one body.¹⁷ To this R. Jose b. Abin demurred:¹⁸ What if he said, ‘Redeem me a firstling’¹⁹ which he had devoted to Temple repair: Would we heed him?²⁰ — [If he says,] ‘Redeem’ — [surely] the Divine Law said that it must not be redeemed!²¹ — Rather said R. Ammi: Did he transmit ought save what he possessed?²²

ALL [SACRIFICES] CAN BE MIXED UP, etc. Why are a sin-offering and a guilt-offering different; [presumably] because one is a male and the other is a female? Then the same applies to a sin-offering and a burnt-offering? — There is the ruler's he-goat.²³ In

the case of a guilt-offering too, there is the ruler's he-goat? — One has hair and the other has wool.²⁴ A Passover-offering and a guilt-offering too cannot be mixed up, for the former is a year old, while the latter is two years old? — There are the Nazirite's guilt-offering and the leper's guilt-offering.²⁵ Alternatively, sometimes a year old looks like a two-year old, and sometimes a two-year old looks like a year old.

MISHNAH. IF A GUILT-OFFERING WAS MIXED UP WITH A PEACE-OFFERING, R. SIMEON SAID: THEY MUST BE SLAUGHTERED AT THE NORTH [SIDE OF THE ALTAR]²⁶ AND EATEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH [THE LAWS OF] THE MORE STRINGENT OF THEM.²⁷ SAID THEY TO HIM: ONE MUST NOT BRING SACRIFICES TO THE PLACE OF UNFITNESS.²⁸ IF PIECES [OF FLESH] WERE MIXED UP WITH PIECES [OF FLESH], MOST SACRED SACRIFICES WITH LESSER SACRIFICES, [PIECES] THAT ARE EATEN ONE DAY WITH [THOSE] THAT ARE EATEN TWO DAYS AND ONE NIGHT, THEY MUST BE EATEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH [THE LAWS OF] THE MORE STRINGENT OF THEM.²⁹

GEMARA. A Tanna recited before Rab: You must not purchase terumah with the money of seventh-year produce, because you diminish the time allowed for its consumption.³⁰ The Rabbis stated in Rabbah's³¹ presence: This does not agree with R. Simeon, for if it agreed with R. Simeon, surely he maintained: One may bring sacrifices³² to the place of unfitness. Said he to them: You may say that it agrees even with R. Simeon: That³³ is only when it was done,³⁴ but not at the very outset.³⁵ ‘But not at the outset’? Abaye raised an objection to him:

(1) V. infra 80a. This refers to the besprinkling of a man defiled through contact with the dead. It is assumed that the same applies to the sprinkling of the blood of a sacrifice, which proves that such does not require a definite quantity at all, and so contradicts Rabbi's present statement.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

- (2) But does not accept it himself.
- (3) The same law does not apply to both.
- (4) Bek. 33a.
- (5) If another animal was proposed as its substitute, whereupon both receive the sanctity of a firstling: does the same law about menstruant women apply?
- (6) So as to become hullin, while the redemption-money becomes sacred.
- (7) When the priest sells it.
- (8) In the sense that the substitute too is holy.
- (9) Subject to the same laws.
- (10) Lit., 'if one caused a firstling to be seized (with sanctity).' On 'Temple repair' v. p. 74. n. 7.
- (11) Can it be sold by weight, or only by general computation? In the former case a higher price will be obtained, so that the Temple repair will benefit more.
- (12) V. Glos.
- (13) It is considered a degradation for a firstling to be treated exactly like hullin and sold by weight, for which reason it is normally forbidden. When other sacrifices become unfit and are redeemed, they are sold by weight in the public market, thereby fetching a higher price, because the money obtained, which is the redemption money, is used for hekdes; this is not permitted in the case of a firstling, because the money goes to the priest. Here, however, that he dedicated it to hekdes, it may be the same as other sacrifices. On the other hand, in the former instance the money is used for buying other animals for sacrifices, whereas here it is used for Temple repair only.
- (14) When they are redeemed. Thus even the other sacrifices, which normally would be sold by the pound, are restricted on account of the firstling. This proves that the degradation of tithe is of greater consideration.
- (15) The sacrifice and the firstling are two separate animals (bodies) and possess different sanctities; therefore you may not degrade the latter in order to obtain a higher price for the former.
- (16) Viz., that of a firstling and that of Temple repair.
- (17) Since the profit arises in the same body, it is possibly permitted, though the profit is utilized for a different purpose.
- (18) What question is there at all: how can you think that we permit its degradation because it was dedicated?
- (19) That it might become altogether hullin, to permit its shearing or being put to the plow, etc.
- (20) Surely not, though the Temple repair would profit thereby.
- (21) That is forbidden by Biblical law, which obviously cannot be transgressed. But the prohibition of selling by weight is only Rabbinical and therefore it may possibly be waived (Rashi).

- (22) A man can only give over what he possesses himself. Since the priest could not sell it by weight for his own use, he cannot empower the Temple repair fund to do so.
- (23) V. Lev. IV, 22f.
- (24) The guilt-offering is a male ram, which has wool. Hence it cannot be mixed up with a he-goat.
- (25) Which are likewise a year old.
- (26) The side prescribed for the slaughtering of a guilt-offering. Peace-offerings could be slaughtered on any side of the Temple court, supra 54b, 55a.
- (27) I.e., as guilt-offerings, viz., during one day and one night only, within the Temple precincts, and by male priests. For a peace-offering v. supra 55a.
- (28) For one of the sacrifices is a peace-offering, and is fit on the second day; we cannot therefore consign it to the place of unfitness, as is necessary in R. Simeon's ruling. Hence they must be left to graze until blemished.
- (29) Here the Rabbis agree, as there is no alternative.
- (30) In the seventh year, when nothing is left for the beasts in the field, this terumah will have to be destroyed, whereas if it had not been purchased with the money of seventh-year produce it could always be eaten. (The terumah itself was not of seventh-year produce, the latter being exempt from terumah or tithe.)
- (31) Marginal emendation. Cur. edd. Raba's.
- (32) Or, holy food in general which includes terumah.
- (33) Sc. R. Simeon's ruling.
- (34) As in the Mishnah: Since the animals were mixed up, there is no alternative.
- (35) There is no need to purchase terumah at the outset, when it will have that effect.

Zevachim 76a

And in all these the priests may deviate in their mode of eating, and eat them roast, stewed, or boiled; and they may season them with condiments of hullin or terumah: that is R. Simeon's ruling!¹ — Leave the terumah of condiments, he replied, as it is [only] Rabbinical.² He raised an objection: You may not purchase terumah with second-tithe money,³ because you reduce its consumption;⁴ but R. Simeon permits it? Thereupon he was silent. When he [Abaye] came before R. Joseph, he said to him, Why did you not refute him from the following: You may not boil seventh-year vegetables in oil of terumah, in order not to bring sacred

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

foods to the place of unfitness;⁶ but R. Simeon permits it? — Said Abaye to him: Did I not refute him from this law of condiments, and he answered me, ‘Leave the terumah of condiments, as it is [only] Rabbinical’? So here too [he would answer me]: The terumah of vegetables is [only] Rabbinical. If so,⁷ he [the Tanna] should teach the reverse, [viz.,] vegetables of terumah with seventh-year oil? — And did I not raise the objection to him, and he answered me, It means where they were mixed together?⁸ so here too [he could answer me] that they were mixed together.⁹ If they were mixed together, what is the reason of the Rabbis?¹⁰ — It is analogous to a guilt-offering and a peace-offering.¹¹ How compare? there it has a remedy, viz., in grazing;¹² whereas here it has no remedy in grazing.¹³ This can only be compared to a piece [mixed up] with other pieces, where, since there is no remedy, they are eaten in accordance with [the laws of] the more stringent of them.¹⁴ To this Rabina demurred: How compare? [when] a piece [is mixed up] with [other] pieces, it has no remedy at all; whereas this has a remedy in squeezing out!¹⁵ And R. Joseph?¹⁶ — How shall we squeeze it out? If we squeeze it out well,¹⁶ — seventh year produce is spoiled;¹⁷ if we squeeze it a little, then after all it remains mixed up.¹⁸

He raised an objection to him: R. Simeon said: On the morrow he brings his guilt-offering together with the log [of oil] and declares: If this is a leper's [offering] this is his guilt-offerings and this is its log [of oil];

(1) V. infra 90b. When he seasons it with terumah, he reduces the time for its consumption, as it is now limited to the time in which the sacrifice may be eaten; and yet R. Simeon permits it even at the outset.

(2) By Biblical law no terumah need be separated at all on condiments. Since it is only Rabbinical, we are not so strict.

(3) V. Deut. XIV, 22-26.

(4) Before it could be eaten anywhere, whereas now in Jerusalem only.

(5) Sc. terumah.

(6) Cf. n. 4, p. 363.

(7) If that is why R. Simeon is lenient.

(8) The oil and the vegetables were accidentally mixed together.

(9) Apparently Abaye answered that he had cited this in refutation of some other ruling (not stated here), and that this had been his reply. Consequently he did not cite it now, as he could give the same reply.

(10) In forbidding it.

(11) Which must be left to graze until they receive a blemish. So here too, the mixture of oil and vegetables must be left, rather than that we should reduce the time during which the terumah may be eaten.

(12) The animals will still be eaten, save that we must wait until they are blemished.

(13) If they may not be boiled together, the terumah is simply wasted altogether.

(14) Hence here too let the Rabbis permit them to be boiled together.

(15) The oil can be squeezed out of the vegetables.

(16) How does he answer this?

(17) The action of strong squeezing damages it.

(18) You cannot extract all the oil.

Zevachim 76b

and if not, let this guilt-offering be a votive peace-offering.¹ That guilt-offering must be slaughtered in the north, and requires sprinkling on the thumbs,² laying [of hands], [the accompaniment of] drink-offerings, and the waving of the breast and the thigh; and it is eaten one day and one night.³ — A man's repair is different.⁴ That is well of the guilt-offering; what can be said about the log [of oil]?⁵ — He declares: [If I was not a leper,] let this log be a votive gift.⁶ But perhaps he was not a leper, and he must take off a fistful?⁷ — He does take off a fistful. But perhaps he was a leper, and he requires seven sprinklings?⁸ — He makes them. But it is defective?⁹ — He brings a little more and replenishes it. For we learnt: If the log became defective before he poured it,¹⁰ he replenishes it. But it [the fistful] must be burnt? — He does burn it [on the altar].¹¹ When? if after the seven sprinklings, it becomes a residue which was reduced between the taking of the fistful and the burning, and you may then not burn the fistful on its account;¹² while if before the seven sprinklings, [we have the exegetical rule:] Every offering whereof a portion has

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

been consigned to the fire [of the altar] is subject to ‘Ye shall not make smoke [burn]’?¹³ —

Said R. Judah the son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi: He brings it up [on the altar] as mere fuel ¹⁴ For it was taught, R. Eliezer said: ‘For a sweet savour’¹⁵ you may not take it up [on the altar], but you may take it up

(1) This refers to a case of doubtful leprosy. ‘On the morrow’ means on the eighth day, the morrow after the final seven days of purification; v. Lev. XIII-XIV. If the man had not actually been a leper he is not liable now to a guilt-offerings and therefore he stipulates that in that event it shall be a votive peace-offering.

(2) V. Lev. XIV, 14.

(3) Like a guilt-offering. Thus he may reduce the time of its consumption (for it may be a peace-offering, which can be eaten two days) even at the outset!

(4) There is no other way by which he can become clean.

(5) This is not a refutation of Raba, but a difficulty in R. Simeon’s statement. The guilt-offering can be a votive peace-offering, if the man was not a leper; but what about the log of oil, to which he is not liable in that case?

(6) For oil could be brought by itself, without an animal sacrifice.

(7) If oil is votively brought, a fistful must be taken off and burnt on the altar; v. infra 91b.

(8) V. Lev. XIV, 16.

(9) As a fistful was removed, there is now less than a log, and that invalidates the rites.

(10) On to his left hand, v. *ibid.* 15.

(11) Then the residue may be consumed in any event. For if he was a leper, it may be consumed, as stated supra 44b. While if this is a votive offering, it is the same as the residue of any meal-offering, which of course is eaten (v. Lev. II,3).

(12) It may be a votive offering, in which case the sprinklings are not a purification rite but simply a lessening of the oil. Now, the fistful had already been taken, and thus between that act and the burning the residue was reduced, in which case the fistful may not be burnt, v. Men. 9b.

(13) V. Lev. II, 11. Here too, perhaps it was a votive offering, and so the burning of the fistful is a valid rite, in accordance with Lev. II, 2 q.v. When this burning has once been done, none of the residue may be burnt again on the altar. Now in this instance the sprinklings of the oil are equivalent to the burning on the altar of part of a

meal-offering; hence just as that would be forbidden, so are the sprinklings forbidden.

(14) Not as a fistful whose burning is a necessary rite. Thus when he sprinkles the oil the priest declares: ‘If he was a leper’ (so that the burning of the fistful was not a rite and does not count, since it was not a votive offering, for only such requires it), ‘this is not a residue, and I sprinkle of the whole, not of the residue. While if he was not a leper’ (so that the burning of the fistful was a necessary rite), ‘let this not be accounted as ritual sprinkling but as merely pouring water on the altar’ (the equivalent of burning the fistful not as a rite, but as though one added fuel to the altar). So Rashi. According to this explanation, the Talmud speaks figuratively: in the difficulty it raises, ‘Ye shall not make smoke’ means that you must not sprinkle, while ‘he brings it up as mere fuel’ in the answer means that he simply pours it out as water. This is perhaps forced, while it is questionable whether this sprinkling is the exact equivalent of the ritual burning of the fistful. Tosaf. therefore explains that the passage is meant literally, this agreeing with R. Akiba who maintained that it is forbidden to burn ritually a fistful of the leper’s log of oil; hence the difficulty, How can he burn this fistful, in case he was a leper? The answer is that he does not burn it ritually, but merely as fuel.

(15) Lev. II, 12.

Zevachim 77a

for fuel.¹ But there is the residue which is to be eaten, whereas we have this little more on whose account no fistful was taken?² — He redeems it.³ Where does he redeem it? If within [the Temple court], then he brings hullin into the Temple court?⁴ If without, it becomes unfit through having gone out?⁵ — In truth, [he redeems it] within, but it is hullin automatically.⁶ Yet surely R. Simeon said: You cannot bring oil as a votive offering? — The repair of a man is different.⁷

R. Rehumi sat before Rabina, and stated in the name of R. Huna b. Tahlifa: Yet let him declare:⁸ Let this guilt-offering be a suspensive guilt-offering?⁹ You may infer from this¹⁰ that the Tanna who disagrees with R. Eliezer and maintains that you cannot bring a suspensive guilt-offering votively is R. Simeon. Said he [Rabina] to him [R. Rehumi]

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

Torah! Torah!¹¹ You have confused lambs with rams!¹²

MISHNAH. IF THE LIMBS OF A SIN-OFFERING WERE MIXED UP WITH THOSE OF A BURNT-OFFERING, R. ELIEZER SAID: HE MUST PLACE [THEM ALL] ON THE TOP [OF THE ALTAR], AND¹¹ REGARD THE FLESH OF THE SIN-OFFERING ON TOP AS THOUGH IT WERE WOOD.¹³ BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: THEY MUST BECOME DISFIGURED, AND THEN GO OUT TO THE PLACE OF BURNING.¹⁴

GEMARA. What is R. Eliezer's reason? — Scripture saith, But they shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar:¹⁵ 'for a sweet savor' you may not take it up [on the altar], but you may take it up as wood. And the Rabbis?¹⁶ — The Divine Law expressed a limitation [in the word] 'them': 'them' you may not bring up [for a sweet savor] but only as wood; but not anything else.¹⁷ And R. Eliezer? — Only [in respect of] 'them' have I included the ascent, making it like the altar, but not [in respect of] anything else.¹⁸ And the Rabbis?¹⁹ — You may infer both things from it.²⁰

Our Mishnah does not agree with the following Tanna. For it was taught: R. Judah said: R. Eliezer and the Sages had no controversy about the limbs of a sin-offering which were mixed up with the limbs of a burnt-offering, [both agreeing] that they must be offered up; [if mixed up] with the limbs of a roba' or a nirba',²¹ [both agree] that they must not be offered. Wherein do they differ? About the limbs of an unblemished burnt-offering which were mixed up with the limbs of a blemished [one]: there R. Eliezer maintains [that] they must be offered up [on the altar], and I regard the flesh of the blemished animal on top as mere wood; while the Sages say: They must not be offered up.

Now [according to] R. Eliezer, why are roba' and nirba' different: [presumably] because

they are not eligible? A blemished animal too is not eligible?

(1) These things which may not be taken up on the altar for ritual burning may be taken up as fuel.

(2) It may be a votive offering, of which a fistful must be taken for the altar, and only in virtue thereof is the rest permitted. Here he added a little after the fistful was taken, and so it was not permitted thereby. As it is mixed up with the rest, all is forbidden.

(3) He declares: 'If he was not a leper, and this log is a votive offering, let the additional oil' (which was not necessary for a votive offering) 'be redeemed by this money.'

(4) As soon as he redeems it, it is hullin, and in the Temple court, whereas hullin may not be brought into the Temple court.

(5) The whole log, for it ranks as most holy, which becomes unfit when taken without.

(6) He does not actually bring hullin into the Temple court.

(7) It is permitted here, as there is no other way out.

(8) If he was not a leper.

(9) To atone for a sin doubtfully committed. For R. Eliezer holds that such can be offered voluntarily, since every man stands in doubt whether he has sinned or not. This is preferable to declaring it a peace-offering, as the former too may only be eaten one day, and so we would not reduce the time permitted for consumption, (10) Since R. Simeon does not adopt this expedient.

(11) Where is your learning?

(12) A leper's guilt-offering must be a year old lamb, whereas a suspensive guilt-offering must be a two year old ram.

(13) It cannot be ritually burnt, but it can be regarded merely as fuel.

(14) They must be kept until they no longer look like flesh and then be taken out and burnt where all unfit flesh is burnt. But they cannot be regarded and treated simply as fuel.

(15) Lev. II, 22. As stated supra 76b, this means that no sacrifice may be ritually burnt (haktarah) on the altar after a portion thereof has already been so burnt.

(16) How do they rebut this?

(17) The two verses (ibid. 11, 12) read: No meal-offering, which ye shall bring unto the Lord, shall be made with leaven; for all leaven and all honey, ye shall not make smoke of it as an offering made by fire unto the Lord (lit. translation). As an offering of first-fruits ye may bring them unto the Lord; but they shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar. Now, as stated supra 76b, the first verse is interpreted to mean that the ritual burning

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

on the altar of anything whose hakarah was already done is forbidden, This is learnt from the apparently superfluous 'of it', and is made to include sacrifices in general, and not particularly honey or leavened bread. The second verse nevertheless teaches that they can be burnt simply as fuel. The Rabbis hold that 'them' in the second verse is a limitation: only those things enumerated in the preceding verse, viz., honey and leavened bread may not come up 'for a sweet savor' yet may come up as fuel; other things, however, which may not come up (as deduced from 'of it'), may not come up at all.

(18) From the words, but they may not come up... to (lit. translation, not on as E.V.) the altar it is inferred that they may not even be placed on the ascent. R. Eliezer holds that 'them' teaches that only leavened bread and honey are so forbidden, but nothing else.

(19) Whence do they know this?

(20) The limitation of 'them' applies to everything that is implied in that verse; hence, as it teaches that things other than honey or leavened bread may not be brought up even as fuel, so it also teaches that they are not included in the interdict of the ascent.

(21) V. supra 71a.

Zevachim 77b

— Said R. Huna: It refers to cataracts in the eye, and is in accordance with R. Akiba who maintained that if they ascended [the altar], they do not descend.¹ Granted that R. Akiba ruled thus if it was done; did he rule thus at the very outset?² — Said R. Papa: The circumstances here are, e.g., that they went up the ascent. If so, even when they are by themselves [they must be offered]?³ —

Rather, [this is] R. Eliezer's reason: The Divine Law expressed a limitation in, 'There is a blemish in them; [they shall not be accepted:]'⁴ only when there is a blemish in them shall they not be accepted, but when they are mixed up they are accepted. And the Rabbis?⁵ — Only when the blemish is in them shall they not be accepted, but if their blemish has gone they are accepted. And R. Eliezer?⁶ — [He derives it] from bam, bahem.⁷ And the Rabbis? — They attribute no significance to bam, bahem. If so, [how

can R. Eliezer say,] 'I regard'. Surely the Divine Law declared it fit?⁹ — He says this to them on their ruling: In my opinion, the Divine Law declared it fit; but [even] on your view, you should at least admit that the flesh of a blemished animal is like wood, by analogy with the flesh of a sin-offering. And the Rabbis? — Here¹⁰ it is repulsive;¹¹ there¹² it is not repulsive.

MISHNAH. [IF THE] LIMBS OF BURNT-OFFERINGS [WERE MIXED UP] WITH THE LIMBS OF A BLEMISHED [BURNT-OFFERING], R. ELIEZER SAID: IF [THE PRIEST] OFFERED THE HEAD OF ONE OF THEM, ALL THE HEADS ARE TO BE OFFERED; THE LEGS OF ONE OF THEM, ALL THE LEGS ARE TO BE OFFERED.¹³ BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: EVEN IF THEY HAD OFFERED ALL EXCEPT ONE OF THEM, IT GOES FORTH TO THE PLACE OF BURNING.

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said: R. Eliezer declared them fit only in twos, but not singly.¹⁴ R. Jacob raised an objection to R. Jeremiah:¹⁵ BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: EVEN IF THEY HAD OFFERED ALL EXCEPT ONE OF THEM, IT GOES FORTH TO THE PLACE OF BURNING?¹⁶ — Said R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa, I will explain it for you: What does ONE mean? One pair.

MISHNAH. IF THE BLOOD WAS MIXED WITH WATER, IF IT RETAINS THE APPEARANCE OF BLOOD, IT IS FIT,¹⁷ IF IT WAS MIXED WITH WINE, WE REGARD IT AS THOUGH IT WERE WATER.¹⁸ IF IT WAS MIXED WITH THE BLOOD OF A DOMESTIC ANIMAL OR BEAST OF CHASE, WE REGARD IT AS THOUGH IT WERE WATER;

(1) V. Bekh. 16a.

(2) That they may be taken up-surely not!

(3) According to R. Akiba, not only when they are mixed up with unblemished animals.

(4) Lev. XXII, 25. 'Shall not be accepted' intimates that they must not be presented on the altar.

(5) How do they interpret this?

(6) How does he know this?

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(7) Scripture writes bam (in them) instead of bahem, as it does in the preceding phrase: 'because their corruption is bahem (in them)'. The change in word suggests a double limitation, and so both are learnt from it. Var. lec.: Scripture writes bam, bahem, i.e., two limiting words.

(8) Lit., 'they do not interpret'.

(9) If the text teaches that the limbs are fit to be burnt on the altar, how can you regard them as mere wood?

(10) In the case of a blemished animal.

(11) To burn it on the altar.

(12) The flesh of a sin-offering.

(13) Burnt on the altar. For I assume that the head or the legs already offered belonged to the blemished animal, and so all the rest are of the unblemished ones; v. supra 74a.

(14) V. supra 74a.

(15) Emended text (Sh. M.).

(16) Hence R. Eliezer must hold that this last one would be offered, which shows that they can be offered singly.

(17) For sprinkling.

(18) And if the blood would lose its appearance in that quantity of water, it is unfit. Similarly the following clauses.

Zevachim 78a

R. JUDAH SAID: BLOOD CANNOT NULLIFY BLOOD.¹ IF IT WAS MIXED WITH THE BLOOD OF UNFIT [ANIMALS],² IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT.³ [IF IT WAS MIXED] WITH THE DRAINING BLOOD,⁴ IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT; R. ELIEZER DECLARED IT FIT. IF HE [THE PRIEST] DID NOT ASK BUT SPRINKLED IT, IT IS VALID.⁵

GEMARA. R. Hiyya b. Abba said in R. Johanan's name: We learnt this⁶ only if the water fell into the blood; but if the blood fell into the water, each drop is nullified as it falls.⁷ R. Papa observed: [But] it is not so in respect to covering, because there is no rejection in precepts.⁸ Resh Lakish said: If Piggul, nothar and unclean [flesh] were mixed up together, and one ate them, he is not culpable, [for] it is impossible that one kind should not exceed the other and nullify it.⁹ You may infer three things from this. You may infer [i]: Interdicts nullify each other. And you may infer [ii]: [The interdict of] taste

in a greater quantity is not Scriptural.¹⁰ And you may infer [iii]: A doubtful warning is not called a warning.

Raba raised an objection: If one made a dough of wheat and rice, if it tastes of corn, it is subject to hallah.¹¹ Now that is so even if the greater part is rice?¹² — [That is] by Rabbinical law [only]. If so, consider the sequel: A man can fulfill his duty thereby on Passover?¹³

(1) Even if the added blood would cause the original blood to lose its appearance if the former were water, the mixture is still fit for sprinkling.

(2) E.g., with the blood of a roba' or a nirba' (v. supra 71a), or the blood of a sacrifice offered with the intention of eating the flesh after time or out of bounds.

(3) The duct or sewer in the Temple court which carried off the blood.

(4) V. p. 173, n. 6.

(5) Even according to the first Tanna.

(6) That if it retains the appearance of blood it is fit, which implies even where there is more water than blood.

(7) Lit., 'the first is nullified'. As each drop of blood falls into the water it is instantaneously nullified, so that even if eventually the mixture looks like blood, it is unfit for sprinkling.

(8) When one slaughters a bird or a beast of chase, he must cover its blood (Lev. XVII, 13). Now, even if this blood fell into water, if the whole looks like blood he must cover it, and we do not say that each consecutive drop was nullified. For though the first drop was indeed nullified, yet when so much has fallen in as to make the whole look like blood it regains its identity and combines with the rest, because where precepts are concerned a thing cannot be permanently rejected and made to lose its identity.

(9) Rashi: if one mixed as much as an olive of two of these (both from Rashi and Tosaf., it appears that 'and unclean flesh' should be deleted), as one chews them together there must be in each piece that he chews rather more of the one kind and less of the other. This lesser part is nullified in the greater and is technically added thereto, whilst the kind which it is, is naturally diminished thereby. This will happen with each piece that he chews, and as it is impossible to equalize them, one of the kinds has less than the standard (as much as an olive is the minimum to involve liability). Now, liability in general is not incurred unless a formal warning, called hathra'ah, is first given to the offender; this warning must be couched in precise

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

terms, e.g., ‘We warn you that for eating so-and-so you will incur such and such penalty.’ In this instance such a precise warning is impossible, for if it is given on account of Piggul, perhaps liability may be incurred on account of nothar, Piggul being short of the standard. Hence only a doubtful warning can be given, and such is not accounted a warning. Tosaf. explains differently.

(10) If forbidden food is mixed even with a greater quantity of permitted food and communicates its taste to it, the whole is forbidden, (even if the former is subsequently removed). From Resh Lakish we learn that this interdict is not Scriptural and therefore does not involve flagellation. For if it were Scriptural, then even when one kind exceeds the other, yet since each imparts its taste to the other, there is the forbidden taste in the full standard, and the offender would be culpable.

(11) V. Glos. and Num. XV, 20. Only a dough of corn (which includes wheat but not rice) is subject to hallah.

(12) Hence the status conferred by taste is Scriptural, since hallah is a Scriptural law.

(13) As much as an olive of unleavened bread must be eaten on the first evening of Passover. This must be made of one of the five species of grain (wheat, barley, rye, oats and spelt), but not of rice, But if this dough counts as a wheat dough only by Rabbinical law, how can one fulfill his Scriptural obligation with it?

Zevachim 78b

Rather, [when] one kind [is mixed] with a different kind, [its status is determined] by taste; [when] one kind [is mixed] with the same kind, [its status is determined] by the greater part.¹ Yet, [where] one kind [is mixed] with its own kind, let us determine [its status] as though it were one kind with a different kind.²

For we learnt: IF IT WAS MIXED WITH WINE, WE REGARD IT AS THOUGH IT WERE WATER. Does that not mean [that] we regard the wine as though it were water?³ — No: [it means that] we regard the blood as though it were water.⁴ If so, he should state, [The blood] is nullified? Moreover, it was taught, R. Judah said: We regard it as though it were red wine if its appearance goes faint, it is valid; if not, it is invalid!⁵ — It is a controversy of Tannaim.⁶

For it was taught: If one immerses a pail containing white wine or milk, we decide by the excess. R. Judah said: We regard it as though it were red wine: if its appearance goes faint, it is valid; if not, it is invalid.⁷ But the following contradicts this: If one immersed a pail full of saliva, it is as though he had not immersed it.⁸ [If it was full of] urine, we regard it as though it were water.¹⁰ If it was filled with water of lustration,¹¹ the water [of the Mikweh] must exceed the water of lustration.¹² Now, whom do you know to hold [that] we regard? R. Judah;¹³ yet he teaches that an excess is sufficient?¹⁴ — Said Abaye: There is no difficulty:

(1) Resh Lakish referred to the latter case. Hence inference [ii] is incorrect.

(2) Since an article cannot be nullified where its taste is distinguishable, even though it is the smaller part of the mixture, let us rule likewise even where its taste is not distinguishable because it is of the same kind.

(3) And if it would then still look like blood, it is fit. Now, in respect to appearance wine and blood may be regarded as of the same kind: this shows that the lesser is not nullified by the greater, but we regard the mixture as of two different kinds,

(4) And it is unfit, because it is nullified by the greater quantity of water.

(5) The passage is quoted in full anon. — This proves definitely that we consider it as a mixture of two different kinds.

(6) The Sages disagree with R. Judah, and Resh Lakish accepts their view,

(7) An unclean pail containing white wine or milk was immersed in a Mikweh (ritual bath) for purification, and the water of the Mikweh naturally filled it, The Sages maintain that if this exceeded the wine or milk (which is not readily distinguishable from the water), the latter is nullified, the whole is regarded as water, and the pail becomes clean. This is similar to the ruling of Resh Lakish. But R. Judah maintains that we regard it as though it were red wine: if there is so little of it that the water of the Mikweh would make it go faint and lose the appearance of wine, the immersion is valid, and the pail becomes clean; otherwise it is invalid, and the pail remains unclean,

(8) The saliva is thick and interposes between the water of the Mikweh and the pail. Hence the immersion is invalid, for there must not be any interposition.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(9) The bracketed words are absent from cur. edd., but were apparently contained in Rashi's edition.

(10) For it is in fact a kind of water, and immediately it makes contact with the water of the Mikveh, it becomes part of the Mikveh itself. For that reason it is not necessary for the water of the Mikveh to exceed it.

(11) Running water mixed with the ashes of the red heifer, used for lustration (v. Num, XIX). Although it cleansed the unclean person upon whom it was sprinkled, it defiled a clean person with its touch.

(12) He must first pour out some of the water of lustration, so that when the pail is filled with the water of the Mikveh, the latter exceeds what is left of the former. For although the latter too is water, owing to its sanctity and to its high degree of uncleanness it does not simply become part of the Mikveh, but must be nullified by an excess.

(13) Only he rules that you regard a thing as though it were something else.

(14) If the Mikveh water exceeds the water of lustration, the immersion is valid, and we do not regard the latter as though it were wine, as above.

Zevachim 79a

The latter is his own view; the former is his teacher's.¹ For it was taught, R. Judah said on R. Gamaliel's authority: Blood cannot nullify [other] blood;² saliva cannot nullify saliva; and urine cannot nullify urine.³

Raba said: We are discussing a pail which is clean on the inside and unclean on the outside;⁴ by law even a small quantity is sufficient,⁵ and it was only the Rabbis who enacted a preventive measure,⁶ lest one begrudge [the water] and not immerse it.⁷ Since then we have an excess [of Mikveh water], nothing else is required.⁸

Raba said: The Rabbis have said that taste [is the determining factor]; and the Rabbis have said [that we decide] by the majority; and the Rabbis have said that [we go] by appearance. [When] one kind [is mixed] with a different kind, taste [is the determining factor]. [When] one kind [is mixed] with the same kind, the greater part [determines its status]; and where there is appearance,⁹ [we go] by looks. Now, [Resh Lakish] disagrees with R. Eleazar. For R. Eleazar said: Just as precepts

cannot nullify one another, so can interdicts not nullify one another.¹⁰ Whom do you know to maintain that precepts cannot nullify one another? —

It is Hillel. For it was taught: It was related of Hillel the Elder that he used to wrap them¹¹ together, for it is said, they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.¹²

(1) His own view is the lenient one. — The interpretation of this whole passage follows Rashi, Tosaf. urges many objections to this, and gives a different interpretation based on an emended text.

(2) In respect to sprinkling; v. supra 35a.

(3) The saliva and the urine of a Zab (q.v. Glos.), which are unclean, cannot be nullified by those of a clean person, which are clean, even though the latter exceed the former. This is a stringent view, and the similar stringent view above is likewise his teacher's ruling, not his own.

(4) E.g., the outside was defiled through unclean water. Such defilement is Rabbinical only, and leaves the inside clean.

(5) Even if a little water enters the pail, it becomes clean, since the inside is clean in any case. — A little must enter, so that we can be sure that it has run over the edge, which is unclean.

(6) I.e., they ruled that it must be properly immersed, with a considerable quantity of water inside.

(7) If he is permitted to immerse the outside only, he may wish to save the water of lustration for further use and not allow even a trickle of Mikveh water to enter the pail.

(8) Raba explains that R. Judah generally agrees with his teacher's stricter ruling, but that here there is a particular reason for his more lenient ruling.

(9) Where taste is irrelevant, as e.g., in the case of a Mikveh, as above.

(10) One forbidden thing cannot nullify another. Resh Lakish ruled supra 78a that forbidden things do annul one another.

(11) Sc. unleavened bread and bitter herbs and the paschal meat, the eating of which is obligatory on the first evening of Passover.

(12) Num. IX, 11, Thus he does not hold that the taste of one nullifies the other.

Zevachim 79b

Our Rabbis taught: As to the shard of a Zab and a Zabah, the first and second time it is unclean, the third time it is clean. When is

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

that? if one poured water into it; but if one did not pour water into it, it is unclean even the tenth time. R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: At the third time it is clean even if one did not pour water into it.¹ Now, whom do you know to maintain that one kind is not nullified by its own kind? R. Judah.² But the following contradicts it: If flax was spun by a niddah,³ he who moves it is clean; but if it is damp, he who moves it is unclean, on account of the fluid of her mouth.⁴ R. Judah said: One also who moistens it in water is unclean, on account of the fluid of her mouth,⁵ even [if he washes it] many times!⁶ — Said R. Papa: Saliva is different, because it is incrustrated.⁷

IF IT WAS MIXED WITH THE BLOOD OF UNFIT [ANIMALS], IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT [etc.] Wherein do they differ? — Said R. Zebid: They differ as to whether a preventive measure is enacted in the Temple: one master holds that we enact a preventive measure, while the other master holds that we do not enact a preventive measure.⁸ R. Papa said: All agree that we do enact a preventive measure, but here they disagree as to whether it is usual for the draining blood to exceed the life blood: one master holds that it is common, while the other master holds that it is not common.⁹ As for R. Papa, it is well: for that reason he teaches, **IF IT WAS MIXED WITH THE BLOOD OF UNFIT [ANIMALS]. IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT; WITH THE DRAINING BLOOD, IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT.**¹⁰ But according to R. Zebid, let him [the Tanna] combine them and teach them together?¹¹ — That indeed is a difficulty.

MISHNAH. [IF] BLOOD OF WHOLE [UNBLEMISHED] ANIMALS [WAS MIXED] WITH BLOOD OF BLEMISHED ANIMALS, IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT. [IF] A GOBLET [WAS MIXED UP] WITH OTHER GOBLETS,¹² R. ELIEZER SAID: IF HE [THE PRIEST] OFFERED [SPRINKLED] ONE GOBLET, ALL THE GOBLETS ARE

OFFERED;¹³ BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: EVEN IF THEY OFFERED ALL OF THEM SAVE ONE, IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT. IF [BLOOD] THAT IS SPRINKLED BELOW WAS MIXED WITH BLOOD THAT IS SPRINKLED ABOVE, R. ELIEZER SAID: HE MUST SPRINKLE [IT] ABOVE, AND I REGARD THE LOWER [BLOOD] ABOVE¹⁴ AS THOUGH IT WERE WATER, AND THEN HE SPRINKLES AGAIN BELOW. BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT.¹⁵ YET IF [THE PRIEST] DID NOT ASK BUT SPRINKLED [IT]. IT IS FIT.

(1) The reference is to an earthen bed-chamber used by a Zab or Zabab, which was broken. The shard thereof, having absorbed their urine, contaminates through carriage, i.e., it defiles anyone who carries it even without actually touching it. Now, if one washed it (the pot) once or twice, it still remains unclean, because that does not suffice to expel the urine; but when one washes it a third time, the urine is held to have been washed out, and so it is clean. That however is only when the pot was washed by pouring water into it each time; if, however, not water but the urine of a clean person (which is ritually clean) was poured into it, this does not render it clean, because they are both of the same kind, viz., urine, and one kind cannot nullify the same kind. R. Eliezer b. Jacob holds that it does nullify, and therefore if it was washed three times, even by pouring the urine of a clean person into it, it is clean.

(2) Hence he must be the author of the first ruling in opposition to R. Eliezer b. Jacob.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) When flax is spun it is moistened with the moisture or saliva of one's mouth. Now, the saliva of a niddah defiles any person who moves it, e.g., when it is on an article, even if he does not touch it; but only as long as it is moist. This explains the passage.

(5) As this re-moistens the saliva.

(6) For the water does not wash it out. This contradicts his statement supra that three washings suffice.

(7) It becomes hardened in the flax and is difficult to remove.

(8) The first Tanna holds that a preventive measure is enacted in the loss of sacred flesh. Therefore, when the blood of a fit sacrifice is mixed with that of an unfit sacrifice or with the draining blood, although the latter may be insufficient to nullify the former, it must be poured out (and hence the sacrifice to which it belonged is

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

declared unfit), as a preventive measure, lest one declare it fit even where the latter is sufficient to nullify the former. (Nevertheless, a preventive measure is not enacted where it is mixed with the blood of an animal or beast that is hullin, because hullin in the Temple court is rare.) R. Eliezer holds that we do not enact a preventive measure, for such would cause the unnecessary loss of sacred flesh. Therefore the mixture is fit for sprinkling unless the unfit blood is so much that if it were water, the fit blood would lose its appearance of blood.

(9) When it is mixed with the blood of an unfit animal (which may happen quite frequently), all, even R. Eliezer, agree that we enact a preventive measure, and the rule of the first part of the Mishnah applies. They disagree only where it is mixed with the draining blood: here R. Eliezer holds that a preventive measure is not enacted, since it is rare for the draining blood to exceed the life blood.

(10) These are taught as separate clauses because R. Eliezer agrees with one and disagrees with the other.

(11) As one clause: if it was mixed up with the blood of unfit animals or with the draining blood, it must, etc. Only one clause is necessary, since R. Eliezer disagrees with both.

(12) The former containing blood of blemished animals, the latter blood of whole animals.

(13) We assume that the first offered was that of the blemished animal, so that the rest are fit.

(14) I.e., the blood which should be sprinkled below but was sprinkled above.

(15) They reject the view that we can regard the lower blood as water, and hold that you cannot deviate in the rites of same (by sprinkling it above) in order to sprinkle the upper blood.

Zevachim 80a

[IF BLOOD] WHICH REQUIRES ONE APPLICATION [WAS MIXED] WITH BLOOD [ALSO] REQUIRING ONE APPLICATION,¹ IT [THE MIXTURE] SHOULD BE PRESENTED WITH ONE APPLICATION. [IF BLOOD] WHICH REQUIRES FOUR APPLICATIONS [WAS MIXED] WITH BLOOD REQUIRING FOUR APPLICATIONS,² THEY MUST BE PRESENTED WITH FOUR APPLICATIONS. [BLOOD] WHICH REQUIRES FOUR APPLICATIONS WITH THAT WHICH REQUIRES ONE APPLICATION, R. ELIEZER SAID: IT [THE MIXTURE] MUST BE PRESENTED WITH FOUR APPLICATIONS.³

R. JOSHUA MAINTAINED: IT MUST BE PRESENTED WITH ONE APPLICATION.⁴ SAID R. ELIEZER TO HIM: BUT LO, HE TRANSGRESSES THE [INJUNCTION] NOT TO DIMINISH [FROM GOD'S COMMANDMENT]! LO, HE TRANSGRESSES THE INJUNCTION NOT TO ADD [THERETO], R. JOSHUA COUNTERED.⁵ THE INJUNCTION NOT TO ADD APPLIES ONLY WHERE IT IS BY ITSELF, REPLIED R. ELIEZER. THE INJUNCTION NOT TO DIMINISH APPLIES ONLY WHERE IT IS BY ITSELF, R. JOSHUA ANSWERED.

MOREOVER, SAID R. JOSHUA, WHEN YOU MAKE [FOUR] APPLICATIONS YOU TRANSGRESS THE INJUNCTION NOT TO ADD, AND COMMIT A POSITIVE ACTION WITH YOUR OWN HANDS; WHEREAS WHEN YOU DO NOT MAKE [FOUR] APPLICATIONS YOU TRANSGRESS THE INJUNCTION NOT TO DIMINISH, BUT DO NOT COMMIT A POSITIVE ACTION WITH YOUR OWN HANDS.

GEMARA. R. Eleazar said: R. Eliezer declared them fit only in twos, but not singly.⁶ R. Dimi raised an objection: BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: EVEN IF THEY OFFERED ALL OF THEM SAVE ONE, IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT.⁷ Said R. Jacob to R. Jeremiah b. Tahlifa: I will explain it to you: What does ONE mean? One pair. Now, both are necessary.⁸ For if it were stated in the former case, I would argue that only there does R. Eliezer rule thus, because his atonement was already made therewith,⁹ but in the present instance he agrees with the Rabbis. While if it were stated in the present case, I would argue that only here do the Rabbis rule thus, but in the former instance they agree with R. Eliezer. Hence both are necessary. We learnt elsewhere: In the case of a flask¹⁰ into which a little water fell,¹¹

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

R. Eliezer said: He [the priest] makes two sprinklings;¹² but the Sages disqualify [it]. As for the Rabbis, it is well: They hold that we assume even distribution,¹³ and sprinkling requires a [minimum] standard, and sprinklings do not combine.¹⁴ But what does R. Eliezer hold? If he holds that there is no even distribution, what if he does sprinkle twice; perhaps he sprinkles [ordinary] water both times? —

Rather, he holds that there is even distribution. Now, if he holds that sprinkling does not require a [minimum] standard, why must he sprinkle twice? —

Rather, he holds that sprinkling does require a [minimum] standard. And if he holds that sprinklings do not combine, what if he does sprinkle twice? And even if sprinklings do combine, who can say that the standard is made up? —

Said Resh Lakish: In truth he holds that there is even distribution, and sprinkling does require a [minimum] standard; but the case we discuss here is where one [standard quantity] was mixed up with another.¹⁵

Raba said: In truth there is even distribution, and sprinkling does not require a standard; but the Rabbis penalized [him] so that he should not benefit thereby.¹⁶ R. Ashi said: There is no even distribution, [therefore] he must sprinkle twice.¹⁷ An objection is raised: Rabbi said: According to R. Eliezer,¹⁸ the sprinkling of any quantity purifies, sprinkling does not require a standard, sprinkling [is permissible if] half [the water] is fit and half is unfit.¹⁹

(1) E.g., the blood of a firstling with that of tithes.

(2) E.g., the blood of a burnt-offering with that of a peace, or a guilt-offering.

(3) And I regard the superfluous three applications in respect of e.g. the firstling as though they were water.

(4) Because one must not make more applications than are necessary. On the other hand, even where four are required one suffices (supra 36b).

(5) V. Deut. IV, 2.

(6) V. supra 74a. Here too, the blood of two goblets must be presented each time together.

(7) V. p. 371, n. 1.

(8) The controversy of R. Eliezer and the Rabbis is taught here and supra 77b, q.v. in reference to limbs.

(9) The limbs were mixed up after the blood was sprinkled. Thus atonement (sc. sprinkling) was already made, and therefore R. Eliezer is lenient.

(10) Containing water sanctified for lustration; v. Num. XIX, 17 seq.

(11) Ordinary, unsanctified water.

(12) On an unclean person, whereby he becomes clean.

(13) Lit., 'there is thorough mixture' — we assume that a mixture is evenly distributed.

(14) The unsanctified water is regarded as evenly distributed in the sanctified. Therefore when he sprinkles, it lacks the minimum standard, since part of it is unfit. He cannot remedy this by sprinkling again, for sprinklings do not combine. (It is assumed that one sprinkling could not contain more than the minimum quantity required.)

(15) Both the unfit and the fit water each contained the minimum standard. Hence when he sprinkles the whole in two applications, he must sprinkle the required amount; v. Parah IX, 1.

(16) The Rabbis ordered two sprinklings instead of one so that we should not benefit by the addition of unfit water to be able to use this for more unclean persons than would otherwise have been possible.

(17) Sprinkling does not require a minimum standard. Now, in one sprinkling only all the water may be the unfit, since there is no even distribution. But in two this is impossible, for only a small quantity fell into it in the first place.

(18) That two sprinklings purify.

(19) This contradicts Resh Lakish.

Zevachim 80b

Moreover, it was explicitly taught: If [blood] which is applied above was mixed with [blood] that is applied below, R. Eliezer said: He must sprinkle [it] above, and the lower [blood] acquits him.¹ But if you say that there is no even distribution, why does it acquit him? perhaps he sprinkled the upper [blood] below and the lower [blood] above? — The case we discuss here is where we have an excess of upper [blood], and he sprinkles above the quantity of the lower [blood] plus a little more.² But he teaches that the lower

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

[blood] acquits him?³ — [It counts] as the residue.⁴

Come and hear: If he [the priest] sprinkled [it]⁵ without asking.⁶ R. Eliezer said: He must re-sprinkle above, and the lower [blood] acquits him?⁷ — Here too the excess was upper [blood], and he sprinkles above the quantity of the lower blood plus a little more. But he teaches that the lower [blood] acquits him? — [It counts] as the residue.

Come and hear: If he sprinkled it above without asking,⁸ both⁹ agree that he must re-sprinkle below, and both [sprinklings] are credited to him!¹⁰ — Here too the excess was upper [blood], and he sprinkles above the quantity of the lower blood plus a little more. Yet surely he teaches: Both [sprinklings] are credited to him? — Does he then teach, ‘Both agree [in this]’? Surely he teaches, ‘Both are credited to him’, this final clause thus agreeing with the Rabbis [only], who maintain that there is even distribution.

Come and hear: IF [BLOOD] WHICH REQUIRES ONE APPLICATION [WAS MIXED] WITH BLOOD [ALSO] REQUIRING ONE APPLICATION, IT [THE MIXTURE] SHOULD BE PRESENTED WITH ONE APPLICATION. Now, if you say that there is no even distribution, why should it be presented with one application? perhaps he sprinkles [the blood] of one [sacrifice] but not that of the other?¹¹ — It means, e.g., where one [minimum quantity] was mixed with another [minimum quantity].¹²

[BLOOD] WHICH REQUIRES FOUR APPLICATIONS WITH [BLOOD] THAT REQUIRES FOUR APPLICATIONS?¹³ There too it means that [the quantity for] four [applications] was mixed with [the quantity for] four [applications].¹⁴ [BLOOD] WHICH REQUIRES FOUR APPLICATIONS WITH [BLOOD] REQUIRING ONE APPLICATION?¹³

(1) When he pours out the residue at the base of the altar, it counts as sprinkling for the burnt-offering.

(2) So that some of the upper blood must be properly sprinkled above.

(3) Whereas all the lower blood was perhaps sprinkled above: how then can the burnt-offering be made fit thereby?

(4) Of the sin-offering, which must be poured out at the base. The burnt-offering, however, does not become fit.

(5) Sc. the mixed blood.

(6) For had he asked, R. Eliezer holds that he would be bidden to sprinkle above first; v. infra 89a.

(7) Here too it is assumed that both sacrifices are thereby made fit.

(8) For had he asked, the Rabbis hold that he would be bidden to pour it out into the duct.

(9) The Rabbis and R. Eliezer.

(10) Thus both sacrifices are fit.

(11) And this does agree with R. Eliezer, since the next clause contains a controversy of R. Eliezer and the Rabbis.

(12) Sc. the minimum quantity for sprinkling (one application). When the Mishnah teaches that he must make one application it means one application on account of each separately.

(13) The same difficulty arises there too.

(14) Here too he must make four applications on behalf of each sacrifice.

Zevachim 81a

And should you answer: Here too it means that [the quantity for] four [applications] was mixed with [the quantity for] one [application],¹ — if so: LO HE TRANSGRESSES THE INJUNCTION NOT TO ADD THERETO, R. JOSHUA COUNTERED: Whence have you here the injunction not to add thereto?² —

Rather said Raba:³ Where [the blood is] mixed together, they do not disagree; they disagree in respect of the goblets. R. Eliezer holds [the view that] ‘we regard’ [etc.], while the Rabbis reject [the view that] ‘we regard’ [etc.].⁴ Now, do they not disagree where [the blood itself] is mingled? Surely it was taught: R. Judah said: R. Eliezer and the Sages did not dispute about the blood of a sin-offering

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

which was mixed with the blood of a burnt-offering, [both agreeing] that it must be offered [sprinkled];⁵ [if it was mixed] with the blood of a roba' or a nirba',⁶ [they agree that] it must not be offered. About what do they disagree? About the blood of an unblemished [animal] which was mixed with the blood of a blemished [animal]; there R. Eliezer maintains that it must be offered, whether [the blood itself is] mingled or whether the goblets [are mixed]; while the Sages say that it must not be offered!⁷ —

R. Judah when teaching R. Eliezer's view relates it to both mixing [of the blood itself] and [to that of] the goblets; but the Rabbis hold that they disagree about goblets [only]. Abaye said: They learnt this only of the beginning of the sin-offering and the burnt-offering;⁹ but as to the end of the sin-offering and the beginning of the burnt-offering,¹⁰ all agree that the place of the burnt-offering is the place of the residue.¹¹ Said R. Joseph to him: Thus did R. Judah say: The residue requires the projection.¹² And thus said Resh Lakish:¹³ They learnt this only of the beginning of the sin-offering and the burnt-offering; but as to the end of the sin-offering and the beginning of the burnt-offering, all agree that the place of the burnt-offering is the place of the residue. Whereas R. Johanan-others say, R. Eleazar-said: There is still the controversy.¹⁴

R. Huna b. Judah raised an objection: They are holy:¹⁵ [this teaches] that if it [the blood of a firstling] was mixed with the blood of other sacrifices, it must be offered [sprinkled]. Surely it speaks of the end of a burnt-offering and [the beginning of] a firstling;¹⁶ and this proves that the place of the burnt-offering is the place of the residue? — No: it speaks of the beginning of the burnt-offering and that of the firstling. What then does it inform us?¹⁷ that sacrifices do not nullify one another!¹⁸ [Surely] that is deduced from [the text]. And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat?¹⁹ — It is

a controversy of Tannaim: one deduces it from this text, and another deduces it from the other text.

Raba raised an objection: And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood, and dash the blood [round about against the altar]:²⁰

(1) Emended text (Sh. M.). Thus R. Eliezer means that four applications must be made in addition to the one, i.e., five in all.

(2) Since there is only sufficient for one application of the blood of the firstling, he certainly sprinkles the blood of the burnt-offering in the other applications, as is actually necessary; thus he does not add thereto.

(3) Sh. M. reads: Rabbah.

(4) The answers given above are now rejected. When it is taught that the lower blood acquits him, it means both as the residue of the upper blood and as the sprinklings of the lower, and the burnt-offering does become fit thereby. Again, when the Mishnah speaks of the mixture, it means even where a large quantity is mixed, and not the minimum quantity required. Nevertheless, this does not prove that R. Eliezer holds that there is even distribution, for all these cases refer not to the mixing of the blood (in one goblet) but to the mixing of the goblets. Here R. Eliezer rules that of each goblet sprinklings must be made above and below, the superfluous sprinklings being regarded as mere water; similarly, if a goblet containing the blood of a firstling is mixed up with another containing the blood of a burnt-offering, four applications must be made from each goblet. The Sages, however, refuse to regard such sprinklings, where they are superfluous, as mere water, and therefore all the blood must be poured out into the duct.

(5) For the Sages too accept the view that 'we regard', etc. (In this R. Judah disagrees with the Tanna of our Mishnah.)

(6) Cf. supra 71a.

(7) The interdict against sprinkling the blood of a blemished animal is contained in Lev. XXII, 25: there is a blemish in them; they shall not be accepted for you. R. Eliezer holds that this applies only where the blood is by itself, but not where it is mixed with that of a sound animal. Now, though R. Judah disagrees with the Tanna of the Mishnah in respect of the scope of the controversy, yet it may be assumed that they both agree that the controversy applies to the mingling of the blood as well as that of the goblets.

(8) Not the Sages who disagree with R. Eliezer, but the scholars who disagree with R. Judah's

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

interpretation of the controversy; hence the anonymous Tanna of our Mishnah. (An anonymous teacher is often referred to as the Rabbis, because he generally represents the Rabbis in general where an opposing view is recorded in the name of an individual.)

(9) The controversy in the Mishnah holds good only at the beginning, i.e., if their blood was mingled before the sprinkling. Only then do the Sages disqualify it, as they reject the view that ‘we regard’, etc., and maintain that we may not sprinkle the blood of the burnt-offering above in order to make the sin-offering fit.

(10) Emended text Sh. M. — I.e., if the residue of the blood of the sin-offering, after it was sprinkled, was mixed with the blood of the burnt-offering before it was sprinkled.

(11) He sprinkles the blood on the wall of the altar below the scarlet line, and thence it drains down on to the base, whither the residue of the blood of the sin-offering should be poured. Thus this counts for both the initial sprinkling of the burnt-offering and the final pouring out of the residue of the sin-offering.

(12) Sc. the base, which projected from the altar. — It must not be poured on to the wall of the altar but directly on to the base. — Hence the Sages disagree even if the blood of the sin-offering had already been sprinkled.

(13) Emended text.

(14) Even in the latter instance.

(15) Num. XVIII, 17. The whole verse reads: But the firstling of an ox... thou shalt not redeem; they are holy. These last words are emphatic and imply that they retain their sanctity, and if their blood is mingled with other blood, it must still be offered. According to the Sages this must mean where it is mingled with lower blood, like itself, e.g., with that of a burnt-offering, but not that of a sin-offering.

(16) I.e., the blood of a burnt-offering after sprinkling was mixed with that of a firstling before sprinkling. (The residue of a firstling is not poured out on the base, and sprinkling completes its blood rites.)

(17) For in that case the text is apparently superfluous; since both bloods need sprinkling on the lower wall of the altar, it is obvious that they must be sprinkled even when they are mingled.

(18) If their blood mingles, even if the blood of one exceeds that of the other, the latter is not nullified.

(19) Lev. XVI, 18. Though the former exceeds the latter, it does not nullify it; v. Men. 22a, b.

(20) Lev. I, 5.

why is ‘blood’ repeated?¹ For one might think: I only know about a burnt-offering which was mixed up with its substitute,² for even [if they were mixed up] whilst alive, they must be offered. Whence do I know to include the thanks-offering and the peace-offering?³ I include the thanks-offering and the peace-offering, because they can be brought as a votive or a freewill-offering,⁴ like itself. Whence do I know to include the guilt-offering? I include the guilt-offering which requires four applications, like itself, Whence do I know [to include] a firstling, tithe, and the Passover-offering? Because it says, blood, blood.⁵ Now surely that speaks of the end of the burnt-offering and [the beginning of] the firstling; whence you may infer that the place of the burnt-offering is the place of the residue? —

No: it speaks of the beginning of the burnt-offering and [that of] the firstling. What then does he inform us? that sacrifices do not nullify one another! [Surely] that is deduced from [the text]. And he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat? — It is a controversy of Tannaim: one deduces it from this text, and another deduces it from the other text. Now, these Tannaim do not learn it from ‘and he shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the goat’, because they hold, You do not mingle [the blood] for [sprinkling] on the horns.⁶ They do not learn it from the repetition of ‘blood’, because they do not attribute any significance to this repetition. But why do they not deduce it from ‘they are holy’?⁷ — They hold [that] ‘they are holy’ [teaches:] ‘they’ are offered, but their substitute is not offered.⁸ And the other?⁹ — He deduces it from, Whether it be ox or sheep, it is the Lord’s:¹⁰ ‘it’ is offered, but its substitute is not offered.

Come and hear: If [the priest] sprinkled [it]¹¹ above without asking, both agree that he must re-sprinkle [it] below, and both are accounted to him. Now does that not mean that [the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

blood of] a sin-offering and [that of] a burnt-offering were mixed, in which case as soon as he sprinkles above, it becomes a residue, yet he teaches, ‘both agree that he must resprinkle [it] below’, which proves that the place of the burnt-offering is the place of the residue? —

When R. Isaac b. Joseph came,¹² he said: In the West¹³ they said: The case we are discussing here is where e.g. [the blood of] an outer sin-offering was mixed with the residue of an inner sin-offering.¹⁴ Said Abaye to him: Yet let the master say, ‘e.g., where it was mixed with a residue’?¹⁵ perhaps this is what you would inform us: Even on the view that the residue¹⁶ is indispensable,¹⁷ yet if some of it is lacking it does not matter?¹⁸ Said Raba Tosfa'ah¹⁹ to Rabina: But we have explained that as meaning that the greater part was upper [blood], and he sprinkles above as much as there was of the lower [blood] plus a little more?²⁰ — That was only, he replied, on the hypothesis first stated that [the Mishnah treats of where the blood itself] was mingled, and in accordance with the thesis that there is no even distribution. But in our final conclusion [we hold that] they disagree where the goblets were mixed up.²¹

MISHNAH. IF [BLOOD] WHICH IS TO BE SPRINKLED WITHIN WAS MIXED WITH [BLOOD] THAT IS TO BE SPRINKLED WITHOUT, IT MUST BE Poured OUT INTO THE DUCT. IF [THE PRIEST] SPRINKLED WITHOUT AND THEN SPRINKLED WITHIN, IT IS VALID. [IF HE SPRINKLED] WITHIN AND THEN RESPRINKLED WITHOUT, R. AKIBA DECLARES IT UNFIT, WHILE THE SAGES DECLARE IT FIT. FOR R. AKIBA MAINTAINED: ALL BLOOD WHICH ENTERED THE HEKAL TO MAKE ATONEMENT IS UNFIT; BUT THE SAGES RULE: THE SIN-OFFERING ALONE [IS UNFIT]. R. ELIEZER SAID: THE GUILT-OFFERING TOO, FOR IT SAYS, AS IS THE SIN-OFFERING, SO IS THE GUILT-OFFERING.²²

GEMARA. Now, let R. Eliezer disagree here too? — What should be done? Shall we [first] sprinkle without and then sprinkle within? [that cannot be done], [because] just as the upper [blood] must precede the lower, so must the inner precede the outer.

(1) Rashi reads: How do we know that if the blood of a burnt-offering was mixed with the blood of another burnt-offering, or with the blood of a substitute (v. p. 22, n. 8), or with the blood of hullin, it must be offered (i.e., sprinkled)? Because it says, blood, blood (i.e., this repetition is an extension). I know it only of these, for even if these were mixed up whilst alive they must be offered. How do I know it even when it is mixed with the blood of a guilt-offering?, etc.

(2) Sc. their blood was mixed. — From the verse I know that their blood must still be sprinkled.

(3) That the blood of a burnt-offering must be sprinkled even if it is mixed with these; similarly the other cases posited.

(4) V. supra 2b, p. 2, n. 6.

(5) The repetition teaches the inclusion of all these.

(6) Of the altar; supra 42b. Hence the blood of each must be stated, because they were taken separately, not mixed together, and so no inference can be made from the text about nullification.

(7) As the first Tanna does.

(8) A substitute of a firstling must be redeemed, but cannot be offered.

(9) The first Tanna: how does he know this?

(10) Lev. XXVII, 26. This refers to a firstling.

(11) The mingled blood.

(12) From Eretz Israel.

(13) Sc. Palestine, which lies to the west of Babylon.

(14) Emended text. After he sprinkles thereof above the red line, all the rest is the residue, which must be poured out at the base.

(15) Not particularly ‘the residue of an inner sin-offering’.

(16) Sc. of the inner sin-offering.

(17) It must be poured out at the base; otherwise the sacrifice is invalid.

(18) It is unnecessary for the whole of the residue to be poured out on the base. For here some of the residue will have been sprinkled above the line, and yet the sacrifice is valid when the rest is poured out at the base.

(19) Perhaps of Thospia. Neub. Geogr. p. 332: capital of the Armenian district Thospitis.

(20) And he applies it below as the residue of the sin-offering, not as the blood of the burnt-offering, which does not become valid. Hence even if it were

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

explained as the mingling of the sin-offering and the burnt-offering, it would not prove that the place of the burnt-offering is the place of the residue, since the burnt-offering does not become fit. Why then must you explain it as meaning that the blood of a sin-offering and the residue were mingled?

(21) And unless it refers to a sin-offering and residue, this contradicts the opinion that the place of the burnt-offering is not the place of the residue.

(22) Lev. VII, 7. V. supra 10b for notes.

Zevachim 82a

Then let us [first] sprinkle within and then sprinkle without? — Since the sin-offering and the guilt-offering become unfit if their blood enters within, he could not give a general ruling.¹

FOR R. AKIBA MAINTAINED, etc. Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: For example, to what may R. Akiba's ruling be compared? To a disciple who was mixing [wine] for his master with hot water,² when he [the master] said to him, Mix me [a drink]. With what?³ he enquired. Are we not occupied with hot water? he replied; now then [I mean] with either hot or cold.⁴ So here too: consider: we are discussing the sin-offering;⁵ for what purpose then does the Divine Law write 'sin-offering'?⁶ [To teach:] I do not mean a sin-offering [alone], but all sacrifices.⁷ To this R. Huna the son of R. Joshua demurred: Consider: all sacrifices are included in respect of scouring and rinsing; why then does the Divine Law write 'sin-offering'?⁸ Hence you may infer from this: only the sin-offering, but nothing else. This then can only be compared to a disciple who was mixing [a drink] for his master with either hot or cold water, when he said to him, Mix it for me with hot water only! —

Rather, R. Akiba's reason is that 'and every sin-offering' is written where '[and] a sin-offering' [would suffice].⁹ For it was taught: 'A sin-offering': I know [this] only [of] a sin-offering; how do we know [it of] most sacred sacrifices [in general]? Because it says, 'Every

sin-offering'. How do we know [it of] lesser sacrifices? Because it says, 'And every sin-offering': this is the view of R. Akiba.

Said R. Jose the Galilean to him: Even if you go on including all day, I will pay no heed to you.¹⁰ Rather: 'a sin-offering': I only know [this of] a private sin-offering;¹¹ whence do we know [it of] a public sin-offering? Because it says, 'Every sin-offering'. Again, I know it only of a male sin-offering: whence do I know [it of] a female sin-offering? Because it says, 'And every'. It is just the reverse!¹² —

Rather, this is what he means: I only know [it of] a female sin-offering: whence do I know [it of] a male sin-offering? From the text, 'And every sin-offering'. Now, does R. Jose the Galilean hold that this text comes for this purpose? Surely it was taught, R. Jose the Galilean said: The whole passage speaks only of the bullocks which were to be burnt and the he-goats which were to be burnt, and its purpose is [i] to teach that when they are disqualified they must be burnt before the Temple; and [ii] to impose a negative injunction against eating them.¹³ Said they to him: As to an [outer] sin-offering whose blood entered the innermost [sanctuary], whence do we know [that it is disqualified]? Said he to them: [From the verse,] Behold, the blood of it was not brought into the sanctuary within?¹⁴ — He argues on R. Akiba's contention.¹⁵

MISHNAH. IF THE BLOOD OF A SIN-OFFERING WAS RECEIVED IN TWO GOBLETS AND ONE OF THEM WENT WITHOUT,¹⁶ THE INSIDE ONE IS FIT.¹⁷ IF ONE OF THEM ENTERED WITHIN,¹⁸ R. JOSE THE GALILEAN DECLARES THE OUTER ONE¹⁹ FIT;²⁰ BUT THE SAGES DISQUALIFY IT. SAID R. JOSE THE GALILEAN: IF THE PLACE WHERE AN INTENTION [DIRECTED TO IT] DISQUALIFIES, [VIZ.,] WITHOUT,²¹ YOU DO NOT TREAT WHAT IS LEFT AS WHAT WENT OUT;²¹ THEN THE PLACE WHERE AN INTENTION [DIRECTED TO IT]

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

DOES NOT DISQUALIFY, [VIZ.,] WITHIN,²² IS IT NOT LOGICAL THAT WE DO NOT TREAT WHAT IS LEFT²³ AS WHAT ENTERED WITHIN? IF IT ENTERED WITHIN TO MAKE ATONEMENT,²⁴ EVEN IF HE [THE PRIEST] DID NOT MAKE ATONEMENT,²⁵ IT IS UNFIT: THESE ARE THE WORDS OF R. ELIEZER.

R. SIMEON SAID: [IT IS NOT UNFIT] UNLESS HE MAKES ATONEMENT. R. JUDAH SAID: IF HE TOOK IT IN UNWITTINGLY,²⁶ IT IS FIT. FOR ALL UNFIT BLOOD WHICH WAS PRESENTED AT THE ALTAR [I.E., SPRINKLED] THE HEADPLATE DOES NOT PROPITIATE,²⁷ SAVE FOR UNCLEAN [BLOOD]. FOR THE HEADPLATE PROPITIATES FOR THAT WHICH IS UNCLEAN, BUT DOES NOT PROPITIATE FOR WHAT GOES OUT.²⁸

GEMARA. It was taught, R. Jose the Galilean said: It is a kal wa-homer: If the place where an intention [directed to it] disqualifies. [viz.,] without, the blood without does not disqualify that which is within;²⁹ then the place where an intention [directed to it] does not disqualify. [viz.,] within, is it not logical that the blood within does not disqualify that which is without? Said they to him, Lo, it says, [And every sin-offering] whereof any of the blood is brought [into the tent of meeting... shall be burnt with fire]:³⁰ [this implies,] even part of its blood. Said he to them: Then you now have a kal wa-homer in respect of [blood] that goes out; if the place where an intention [directed to it] does not disqualify [viz.,] within, yet the blood within disqualifies [the blood] without; where intention does disqualify, [viz.,] without, it is not logical that the blood without disqualifies [the blood] within? Said they to him: Lo, it says, whereof [any of the blood] is brought [into, etc.]: that which enters within disqualifies, but that which goes out does not disqualify. Now, let intention [to sprinkle] within³¹ disqualify, a fortiori: if though³² blood without does not disqualify [the blood] within, yet intention without³³ disqualifies;

then seeing that the blood within does disqualify the blood without, is it not logical that intention within disqualifies? Lo, it says: On the third day:³⁴

- (1) That the blood should be sprinkled first within and then without, since this would not apply to these two. Therefore his view is not stated at all.
- (2) Their wine was too strong to be drunk without dilution.
- (3) Hot or cold water.
- (4) As you were actually mixing wine with hot water, I had no need to say anything at all. Therefore when I told you to mix me a drink, I meant that it could be with either hot or cold water (Tosaf.).
- (5) The whole section in Lev. VI, 19-23 q.v. treats of the sin-offering.
- (6) Ibid. 23: And every sin-offering whereof any of the blood is brought into the tent of meeting to make atonement in the holy place (i.e., an outer sin-offering whose blood is sprinkled on the inner altar) shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire.
- (7) Interpreting: And even every sin-offering, although some sin-offerings must be brought within, and how much the more other sacrifices!
- (8) Lev. VI, 21 states: But the earthen vessel wherein it (sc. the sin-offering) is sodden shall be broken; and if it be sodden in a brazen vessel, it shall be scoured and rinsed in water. The following verse states 'it is most holy' from which it is inferred infra 96b that the law of scouring and rinsing applies to all sacrifices. Hence at this stage (v. 22) we are already treating of all sacrifices; if then v. 23 is to apply likewise to all, Scripture should simply write: And that whereof any of the blood, etc.
- (9) Lit., 'R. Akiba's reason is from sin-offering, and every sin-offering.'
- (10) I reject your view that 'and' and 'every' are extensions which include other kinds of sacrifices, seeing that the passage speaks of sin-offerings only.
- (11) For this section is followed by sections on the guilt-offering and the peace- and thanks-offerings, which were private sacrifices.
- (12) The usual sin-offering is a female, and no extension is needed to include it.
- (13) This refers to the verse under discussion, which the Rabbis relate to an outer sin-offering whose blood was carried into the inner court, thereby disqualifying it. But R. Jose the Galilean relates it to an inner sin-offering, e.g., the bullock brought when the entire congregation sins in ignorance (v. Lev. IV, 13 f). Hence he interprets: And every sin-offering whereof any of the blood is (rightly) brought into the tent of meeting, etc. shall not be eaten. Now this is superfluous in respect of a

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

valid sacrifice, since it is explicitly stated in IV, 21: and he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn it. Consequently, the verse must mean that if it became unfit through going outside its legitimate boundary or through defilement, it must be burnt in front of the Birah (the Temple), and not carried ‘without the camp’. i.e., beyond the Temple Mount. Further, this prohibits the eating of its flesh by a negative injunction, violation of which involves flagellation (Lev. IV, 21 merely contains an affirmative precept, the disregard of which is not punished by flagellation). Thus R. Jose the Galilean does not relate this text to outer sin-offerings at all.

(14) Lev. X, 18; v. supra 10b.

(15) He personally holds that it refers to inner sin-offerings. But he argues that even on R. Akiba's view that it refers to outer sin-offerings, the extension of ‘and’ and ‘every’ must apply to sin-offerings likewise, not to other sacrifices.

(16) Sc. the Temple court.

(17) One can sprinkle the blood in it, and the sacrifice is valid.

(18) Into the Hekal, the inner sanctum.

(19) I.e., the one that remained in the Temple court.

(20) For sprinkling.

(21) An intention at the shechitah to sprinkle the blood without the Temple court disqualifies the sacrifice. Yet if one actually carried one goblet without, we do not regard the other goblet as though it too had been carried without, for the first clause states, **THE INSIDE ONE IS FIT**.

(22) The intention to sprinkle the blood within, in the Hekal, does not disqualify the sacrifice.

(23) V. p. 389, n. 7.

(24) If it was carried into the Hekal for sprinkling.

(25) He did not actually sprinkle it.

(26) Not knowing that it was forbidden.

(27) Make it fit.

(28) v. supra 23b.

(29) As in the Mishnah.

(30) Lev. VI, 23.

(31) I.e., the intention to take the blood into the Hekal.

(32) Lit., ‘where’.

(33) Sc. the intention to sprinkle the blood without.

(34) Lev. VII, 17.

fortiori: if although the blood within disqualifies [the blood] without, an intention concerning within does not disqualify; then seeing that the blood without does not disqualify [the blood] within, is it not logical that an intention concerning without shall not disqualify? Therefore Scripture writes ‘third’, which means after time; while Piggul means without bounds.² Flesh which goes without becomes unfit; that which enters within, is fit. Now, logically it might be unfit. For if though the blood without does not disqualify [the blood] within, flesh which goes without becomes unfit; then since blood within does disqualify [blood] without, is it not logical that flesh which enters within shall be disqualified? Lo, it says, any of the blood: its blood [disqualifies],³ but not its flesh. Then in that case you can argue a **fortiori:** if though the blood within disqualifies [the blood] without, flesh that enters within is fit; then since blood without does not disqualify [blood] within, is it not logical that flesh that goes without is fit? Lo, it says. Therefore ye shall not eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field:⁴ once flesh passes without bounds, it is forbidden.⁵

Our Rabbis taught: [Behold the blood of it was not brought into the sanctuary] within:⁶ I only know [it of] within;⁷ how do we know [it of] the Hekal? Because it says, into the sanctuary within.⁸ Then let the ‘sanctuary’ be stated, but not ‘within’? —

Said Raba: One comes and illumines the other,⁹ this being analogous to the case of toshab and sakir. For it was taught: Toshab means one [a Hebrew slave] acquired in perpetuity; sakir, one purchased for a period of [six] years.¹⁰ Now, let toshab be stated, but not sakir, and I would reason: if one acquired in perpetuity may not eat, how much more so one acquired only for a period of [six] years?¹¹ Were it so, I would say: Toshab is one purchased for a limited period, but one acquired in perpetuity may eat. Therefore sakir comes and teaches the meaning of

Zevachim 82b

[this teaches that the illegitimate intention must refer to] a place with a threefold function, [viz.,] in respect of blood, flesh, and emurim.¹ Now, let an intention concerning without not disqualify [the sacrifice], a

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

toshab, that the latter is one purchased in perpetuity, while the former is one purchased for a period of [six] years, and [neither] may eat. Said Abaye to him, As for there, it is well: They are two persons, and though Scripture could write, A [slave] whose ear was bored may not eat,¹² and the other would be inferred a minori, yet Scripture [often] takes the trouble to write a thing which is derived a minori. But here, since it becomes unfit in the Hekal, what business has the inner sanctuary?¹³ —

Rather said Abaye: It is required only [where the priest takes] a circuitous route.¹⁴ Said Raba to him: But ‘entering’ is written in connection therewith?¹⁵ — Rather said Raba: Whatever [the priest] intends [to carry into] the innermost sanctuary does not become unfit in the hekal.¹⁶

Raba asked: What if [the priest] carried the blood of the congregational bullock for forgetfulness or the he-goat for idolatry into the innermost sanctuary?¹⁷ Do we say, [Scripture writes] ‘into the sanctuary within’; wherever we read ‘into the sanctuary’ we read ‘within’, and wherever we do not read ‘into the sanctuary’, we do not read ‘within’?¹⁸ Or perhaps, it is not in its place.¹⁹ Now, should you answer that it is not in its place, what if [the priest] sprinkled the blood of the bullock and that of the he-goat of the Day of Atonement on the slaves, then carried it out into the hekal,²⁰ and then took it in again?²¹ Do we say, It is their place; or perhaps, once it has gone out, it has gone out?²² Should you answer, Once it has gone out, it has gone out: What if he sprinkled their blood on the veil,

- (1) V. supra 29a.
- (2) V. supra 28a and whole discussion there.
- (3) When it is brought into the Hekal.
- (4) Ex. XXII, 30.
- (5) ‘In the field’, is apparently superfluous. Hence it is interpreted as intimating that when flesh is found beyond its bounds (as a field, which has no barriers), it is a Terevah (lit., torn of the beasts’), and forbidden.

- (6) Lev. X, 28.
- (7) i.e., only if the blood is taken into the innermost sanctuary is the sacrifice disqualified.
- (8) The sanctuary corresponds to the Hekal, which contained the Table and the Candlestick (v. Ex. XXV, 23. 31), and led into the Holy of Holies; cf. infra 83a.
- (9) Only because ‘within’ is written do we know that ‘sanctuary’ means the Hekal (for otherwise it is superfluous). But if ‘sanctuary’ alone were written, it might mean the innermost sanctuary.
- (10) The reference is to Lev. XXII, 10: A toshab of a priest, or a sakir, shall not eat of the holy thing (i.e., terumah).
- (11) For the former is more of the priest's chattel (v. ibid. 10) than the latter.
- (12) V. Ex. XXI, 5 f.
- (13) For, in order to get into the inner sanctuary it must pass through the Hekal.
- (14) E.g. he enters the innermost sanctuary by way of the roof or through upper chambers, avoiding the Hekal altogether.
- (15) Which implies that it becomes unfit only if he enters the innermost sanctuary in the usual way.
- (16) This is intimated when Scripture states both ‘sanctuary’ and ‘within’. Hence if he changes his mind after carrying it into the Hekal and takes it back, it remains fit.
- (17) If the whole congregation sins through having forgotten a law a bullock must be sacrificed; for unwitting idolatry a he-goat is brought. The blood of these must be taken into the Hekal, but not into the innermost sanctuary.
- (18) Only where the sacrifice is disqualified when the blood is taken ‘into the sanctuary’ (i.e., the Hekal), it is likewise disqualified when it is taken ‘within’ (the innermost shrine), but not otherwise.
- (19) The text implies that when the blood is taken without bounds the sacrifice is disqualified, and that applies here too.
- (20) To sprinkle the blood on the veil, as is necessary.
- (21) Into the innermost shrine: this was no longer necessary.
- (22) And must not be taken in again.

Zevachim 83a

carried it out to the altar, and then carried it within? Here it is certainly the same place; or perhaps, we designate this carrying [going] out?¹ The questions stand over.

IF IT ENTERED WITHIN TO MAKE ATONEMENT. It was taught, R. Eliezer said: It is stated here, to make atonement in the

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

holy place;² and it is stated elsewhere, And there shall be no man in the tent of appointment when he goeth in to make atonement in the holy place:³ as there it means when he has not yet made atonement,⁴ so here too it means when he has not yet made atonement.⁵

R. Simeon said: It is stated here, ‘to make atonement’; and it is stated elsewhere, ‘And the bullock of the sin-offering, and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement’:⁶ as there it means when he had [already] made atonement,⁷ so here it means where he made atonement.⁸ Wherein do they differ? — One master holds, You learn without from without,⁹ but you do not learn without from within;¹⁰ while the other master holds: You learn an animal from an animal, but you do not learn an animal from man.

R. JUDAH SAID, etc. But if [the priest took it in] deliberately, it is disqualified; [when?] if he made atonement, or [even] if he did not make atonement? — Said R. Jeremiah, It was taught:¹¹ Since it is said, ‘And the bullock of the sin-offering, and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place’; why is it [further] said, And he that burneth them [shall wash his clothes]?¹² (You ask, why is it further said, ‘And he that burneth them’? that is required for itself!)¹³ —

Rather [the question is] why is ‘sin-offering, repeated? Because we have only learnt that when the bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement are burnt they defile garments; how do we know [the same of] other [sacrifices] which are burnt? — Because ‘sin-offering’ is repeated:¹⁴ these are the words of R. Judah. R. Meir said: That [exegesis] is unnecessary.¹⁵ Lo, it says, ‘And the bullock of the sin-offering and the he-goat of the sin-offering’: now, ‘to make atonement’ need not be stated;¹⁶ why then is ‘to make atonement stated? It teaches that with all atoning

sacrifices,¹⁷ he that burns them [the sacrifices] defiles his garments. Whereas R. Judah does not understand ‘to make atonement’ in that way. What is the reason? Surely because he utilizes it for a gezerah shawah.¹⁸

CHAPTER IX

MISHNAH. THE ALTAR SANCTIFIES WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR IT.¹⁹ R. JOSHUA SAID: WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR FIRE DOES NOT DESCEND [THENCE] ONCE IT ASCENDED, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, THAT IS THE BURNT-OFFERING UPON ITS FIREWOOD:²⁰ AS THE BURNT-OFFERING, WHICH IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR FIRE, DOES NOT DESCEND ONCE IT ASCENDED, SO WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR FIRE DOES NOT DESCEND ONCE IT ASCENDED.

R. GAMALIEL SAID: WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR DOES NOT DESCEND ONCE IT ASCENDED, BECAUSE IT IS SAID: THAT IS THE BURNT-OFFERING UPON ITS FIREWOOD UPON THE ALTAR: AS THE BURNT-OFFERING, WHICH IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR, DOES NOT DESCEND ONCE IT ASCENDED, SO WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR DOES NOT DESCEND ONCE IT ASCENDED. R. GAMALIEL AND R. JOSHUA DIFFER ONLY IN RESPECT OF THE BLOOD AND LIBATIONS, R. GAMALIEL MAINTAINING THAT THEY MUST NOT DESCEND, WHILE R. JOSHUA MAINTAINS THAT THEY MUST DESCEND.²¹

R. SIMEON SAID: IF THE SACRIFICE IS FIT WHILE THE LIBATIONS [WHICH ACCOMPANIED IT] ARE UNFIT; OR IF THE LIBATIONS ARE FIT WHILE THE SACRIFICE IS UNFIT; OR EVEN IF BOTH ARE UNFIT, — THE SACRIFICE MUST NOT DESCEND, WHILE THE LIBATIONS DO DESCEND.²²

(1) V. Lev. XVI, 18 f: And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock,

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times. According to the Talmud this refers to the golden altar which was in the same portion as the veil. Hence 'and he shall go out' can only mean that he passes beyond the whole altar, i.e., he must not stand on the inner side of the altar, between it and the veil, but on the outer side, between it and the door. In the present instance he carried the blood back on the inner side of the altar; and the question is: as it is in the same portion as the veil, perhaps it does not disqualify it; or do we say that since Scripture designates going to the outer side of the altar 'going out' the inner side is ipso facto a separate place and disqualifies it?

(2) Lev. VI, 23.

(3) Ibid. XVI, 17.

(4) No man must be there when he is about to make atonement.

(5) The flesh is disqualified if the blood is taken into the Hekal to make atonement, even if atonement was not made, i.e., the blood was not sprinkled there.

(6) Lev. XVI, 27.

(7) That is evident from the whole passage.

(8) Only then is the sacrifice disqualified.

(9) Viz., the law about the bullock whose blood must be sprinkled without from the man who is bidden to stay without.

(10) From the Day of Atonement sacrifice whose blood is rightly brought within.

(11) Emended text (Sh. M.).

(12) Ibid. 28.

(13) To teach that his garments are defiled.

(14) The second one being superfluous, it extends the law to all sin-offerings which are burnt.

(15) It is implied in the Biblical text itself.

(16) We already know from the context that that was its purpose.

(17) I.e., all those for whom atonement is made.

(18) Sc. as R. Simeon supra. Accordingly, the sacrifice is disqualified only if he did make atonement.

(19) I.e., anything which was appointed for the altar, even if it subsequently became unfit, is nevertheless sanctified by the altar in the sense that if laid upon it, it must not be removed.

(20) Lev. VI, 2.

(21) R. Joshua and R. Gamaliel disagree as to the meaning of 'WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR IT'. R. Joshua holds that it means whatever is eligible for the altar fire, i.e., to be burnt on the altar, such as the limbs of a burnt-offering. Blood and libations, however, which are not meant for burning on the altar at all, must be taken down even laid on it. R. Gamaliel maintains that

ELIGIBLE means in any capacity, and so if these ascended, they do not descend.

(22) R. Simeon agrees with R. Joshua where the libations accompany a sacrifice, and with R. Gamaliel where they come by themselves. His view is discussed below.

Zevachim 83b

GEMARA. Only what is ELIGIBLE FOR IT, but not what is not eligible for it; what does this exclude?¹ — Said R. Papa: It excludes 'fistfuls'² which were not sanctified in a [service] vessel.³ To this Rabina demurred: How does this differ from 'Ulla's [ruling]? For 'Ulla said: If the emurim of lesser sacrifices were laid [on the altar] before the sprinkling of their blood, they are not removed, [because] they have become the food of the altar!⁴ — The latter do not themselves lack a rite, while the former themselves lack a rite.⁵

R. JOSHUA SAID: WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE ALTAR FIRE, etc. And R. Gamaliel too? Surely it is written, the burnt-offering upon its firewood? — That comes to teach that [limbs] which spring off [from the altar] must be replaced.⁶ And the other;⁷ how does he know that the [limbs] which spring off must be replaced? — He deduces it from whereto the fire hath consumed.⁸ And the other?⁹ — That is required [for teaching]: What was consumed as a burnt-offering you must replace, but you do not replace what was consumed as incense [ketoreth]. For R. Hanina b. Minyomi the son of R. Eliezer b. Jacob recited: [And he shall take up the ashes] whereto the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering on the altar: what was consumed as a burnt-offering you replace, but you do not replace what was consumed as incense. And the other?¹⁰ — Do you then not learn automatically that we replace what was consumed as a burnt-offering?¹¹

R. GAMALIEL SAID: WHAT IS ELIGIBLE, etc. And R. Joshua too: surely

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

upon the altar is written? — He requires that [as follows]: What does the Divine Law say? Whatever is eligible for its firewood, the altar sanctifies.¹² And the other?¹³ — Another ‘altar’ is written.¹⁴ And the other?¹⁵ —

One [is required] where it had a period of fitness,¹⁶ while the other [text] is required where it had no period of fitness.¹⁷ And the other?¹⁸ — Since they are [now] unfit and the Divine Law included them,¹⁹ there is no difference whether they had a period of fitness or did not have a period of fitness.

R. SIMEON SAID: IF THE SACRIFICE IS FIT, etc. It was taught, R. Simeon said: [Scripture speaks of] a burnt-offering: as a burnt-offering comes on its own account, so all which come on their own account [are included]:²⁰ [hence] libations which come on account of a sacrifice are excluded. R. Jose the Galilean said: From the text, ‘Whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy’, I understand whether it is eligible [for the altar] or not eligible. Therefore Scripture states: [Now this is what thou shalt offer upon the altar: two] lambs:²¹ as lambs are eligible [for the altar], so whatever is eligible [is included]. R. Akiba said: [Scripture states,] burnt-offering:²² as a burnt-offering is eligible [for the altar], so whatever is eligible [is included]. Wherein do they differ? —

Said R. Adda b. Ahabah: They differ about a disqualified burnt-offering of a bird: one master deduces [the law] from ‘burnt-offering’,²³ while the other master deduces it from ‘lambs’.²⁴ Now, as to the one who deduces it from ‘lambs’, surely ‘burnt-offering’ [too] is written? — If ‘lambs’ were written while ‘burnt-offering’ were not written, I would think [that the law applies] even [if they became disqualified] while yet alive:²⁵ therefore the Divine Law wrote ‘burnt-offering’.²⁶ And as to the one who deduces it from ‘burnt-offering’, surely ‘lambs’ is written? — If ‘burnt-offering’ were written while ‘lambs’ were not written, I

would think [that the law applies] even [to] a meal-offering.²⁷ Therefore the Divine Law wrote ‘lambs’. Wherein do these Tannaim and the Tannaim of our Mishnah differ? —

Said R. Papa: They differ in respect of fistfuls which were sanctified in a [service] vessel.²⁸ According to our Tannaim, they do not descend;²⁹ while according to the other Tannaim they descend.³⁰ Resh Lakish said: With regard to a meal-offering which comes by itself,³¹ all³² of them hold that it does not descend; but according to R. Jose the Galilean and R. Akiba

(1) On which both R. Joshua and R. Gamaliel will agree.

(2) Taken from meal-offerings; v. Lev. II, 2.

(3) These are not considered eligible at all, and even if laid on the altar they must be removed.

(4) Now, the fistfuls of a meal-offering correspond to the emurim of animal sacrifices; and the former are sanctified for the altar by being placed in a service vessel, while the latter are likewise sanctified by the sprinkling of the blood. Hence the same law should apply to both.

(5) Nothing more was to be done to the emurim themselves, and only the blood still required sprinkling. Whereas the fistfuls themselves should first have been placed in a service vessel.

(6) Because ‘upon its firewood’ implies that whatever has already become as firewood and is feeding the flames of the altar must remain as a burnt-offering; so that if anything springs off it must be put back.

(7) R. Joshua.

(8) Lev. VI, 3. That is superfluous, as it is obvious that the ashes are the result of the fire. Hence it is interpreted as intimating that whatever once fed the fire belongs to the altar, even if it jumped off.

(9) R. Gamaliel; how does he utilize that text?

(10) R. Joshua; how does he know this?

(11) If the text teaches that you must replace whatever sprang off, that obviously includes what was consumed as a burnt-offering. And at the same time, since the whole passage treats of the burnt-offering only, you cannot make it refer to incense.

(12) I.e., ‘upon the altar’ does not extend the law, as R. Gamaliel maintains, but intimates why whatever is eligible for the altar-fire must be replaced, viz., because the altar sanctified it.

(13) Where does he find the reason?

(14) Ex. XXIX, 37: Whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

- (15) R. Joshua: what need is there of two texts?
(16) Before it became unfit, e.g., if it was kept overnight, taken out of bounds, or defiled.
(17) E.g., if it was slaughtered with an illegitimate intention.
(18) R. Gamaliel: whence does he know this?
(19) In the law that they must remain on the altar if laid thereon.
(20) In the law that if laid on the altar they must remain there.
(21) Ex. XXIX, 38. This immediately follows the text quoted.
(22) Ibid. 42. Rashi says that it is written in the present verse (38). In fact, it is absent in the M.T. in this verse, but found in the Samaritan Text; v. Sanh. (Sonc. ed.) p. 34a
(23) Hence it includes a burnt-offering of a bird too.
(24) Hence only animal sacrifices are included, but not a burnt-offering of a bird.
(25) E.g., if it had a cataract on the eye.
(26) Intimating that this law applies only from the time that it was fit to ascend as a burnt-offering (in Heb. 'ascend' — the altar — and 'burnt-offering' are the same word viz., 'olah). Yet the law still applies to animal sacrifices only.
(27) By interpreting 'olah that which ascends (v. preceding note), and so including everything that ascends the altar.
(28) But were subsequently disqualified.
(29) For they infer the law from 'its firewood' and 'on the altar' and these fulfill the conditions implied in these words, as they feed the fire and are brought on the altar.
(30) As they cannot be included in 'lambs' or 'burnt-offering'.
(31) It does not accompany an animal sacrifice.
(32) I.e., all except those whom he specifies. Similarly the other cases.

Zevachim 84a

it does descend.¹ With regard to a meal-offering which accompanies a sacrifice, in the view of R. Gamaliel and R. Joshua it does not descend,² while in the view of all [the others] it does descend. Libations which come by themselves,³ in the view of all of them, descend, but in the view of R. Gamaliel and R. Simeon they do not descend. Libations which come together with a sacrifice, in the view of all of them, descend, and only in the view of R. Gamaliel do they not descend. That is obvious?⁴ — He needs [to state this on account of] a meal-offering which comes by

itself,⁵ and in accordance with Raba. For Raba said: A man can vow a meal-offering of libations every day.⁶ Then let [Resh Lakish] inform us [this law], as Raba?⁷ — He needs [to state the law about] libations which come with a sacrifice, where he offers them [the libations] on the morrow or on some other day.⁸ I might argue, Since a master said: And the meal-offerings thereof and their drink-offerings⁹ [can be brought] at night; 'the meal-offerings thereof and their drink-offerings' [can be brought] on the morrow,¹⁰ they are as drink-offerings [libations] which are brought by themselves, and R. Simeon admits that they do not descend. Hence he [Resh Lakish] informs us [that it is not so].

MISHNAH. THE FOLLOWING DO NOT DESCEND ONCE THEY ASCENDED: [FLESH] THAT IS KEPT OVERNIGHT, OR THAT GOES OUT [OF ITS PERMITTED BOUNDARIES], OR WHICH IS UNCLEAN, OR WHICH WAS SLAUGHTERED [WITH THE INTENTION OF CONSUMING SAME] AFTER TIME OR WITHOUT BOUNDS; OR IF UNFIT [PERSONS] RECEIVED AND SPRINKLED ITS BLOOD. R. JUDAH SAID: THAT WHICH WAS SLAUGHTERED AT NIGHT OR WHOSE BLOOD WAS SPILT OR WHOSE BLOOD PASSED WITHOUT THE HANGINGS,¹¹ IF IT ASCENDED, MUST DESCEND.

R. SIMEON SAID: IT DOES NOT DESCEND; BECAUSE R. SIMEON MAINTAINED: IF ITS DISQUALIFICATION AROSE IN THE SANCTUARY, THE SANCTUARY¹² RECEIVES IT; IF ITS DISQUALIFICATION DID NOT ARISE IN THE SANCTUARY, THE SANCTUARY DOES NOT RECEIVE IT. THE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE FOLLOWING DID NOT ARISE IN THE SANCTUARY: A ROBA' AND NIRBA', ONE SET ASIDE [FOR AN IDOLATROUS SACRIFICE]; AN ANIMAL WORSHIPPED [IDOLATROUSLY]; [A HARLOT'S] HIRE; [A DOG'S] EXCHANGE; KIL'AYIM; TEREFAH; AN ANIMAL CALVED THROUGH THE CAESAREAN SECTION; AND BLEMISHED ANIMALS.¹³

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

R. AKIBA DECLARED BLEMISHED ANIMALS FIT.¹⁴ R.HANINA THE SEGAN¹⁵ OF THE PRIESTS SAID: MY FATHER USED TO REPULSE BLEMISHED ANIMALS FROM OFF THE ALTAR. JUST AS THEY DO NOT DESCEND ONCE THEY ASCENDED, SO THEY DO NOT ASCEND IF THEY HAD DESCENDED. AND ALL OF THESE, IF THEY ASCENDED TO THE TOP OF THE ALTAR WHILST ALIVE, MUST DESCEND. IF A BURNT OFFERING WENT UP ALIVE TO THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, IT MUST DESCEND. IF ONE SLAUGHTERED IT ON THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, HE MUST FLAY IT AND DISMEMBER IT WHERE IT LIES.¹⁶

GEMARA. It was taught, R. Judah said: [This is the law of the burnt-offering:] it is that which goeth up [on its firewood upon the altar all night unto the morning];¹⁷ here you have three limitations. It excludes [an animal] slaughtered at night; [an animal] whose blood was spilt; and [an animal] whose blood passed out beyond the hangings: if any one of these ascended [the altar], it must descend. R. Simeon said: ‘Burnt-offering’: I only know this of a fit burnt-offering; whence do I know to include one which was slaughtered at night, or whose blood was spilt, or whose blood passed without the hangings, or [the flesh of] which spent the night [away from the altar], or went out, or the unclean, or which was slaughtered [with the intention of burning its flesh] after time or without bounds; or whose blood was received and sprinkled by unfit [persons]; or whose blood was applied below [the scarlet line] when it should be applied above, or above when it should be applied below; or without when it should be applied within, or within when it should be applied without; or a Passover-offering or a sin-offering which one slaughtered for a different purpose: whence do we know [to include all these]? From the phrase, ‘the law of the burnt-offering’, which intimates one law for all burnt-offerings [viz.,] that if they ascended, they do not descend. You might think that I also include a roba’ and a nirba’,

one set aside [for an idolatrous sacrifice], or worshipped; a [harlot's] hire or the price [of a dog], or a hybrid, or a Terefah or an animal calved through the caesarean section. Scripture, however, states: ‘it is that.’ And why do you include the former and exclude the latter? Since Scripture includes

- (1) As stated above.
- (2) Since ‘upon its firewood’ and ‘on the altar’ are applicable to it.
- (3) E.g., if one vows wine without a sacrifice.
- (4) All this directly follows from their views stated above.
- (5) I.e., to teach that a meal-offering can be brought alone.
- (6) I.e., even without a sacrifice, which naturally would not be vowed so frequently.
- (7) Explicitly, and not overlay it with all the other rulings.
- (8) Not at the same time as the animal sacrifice.
- (9) Num. XXIX, 6 et passim. ‘Their’ refers to the animal sacrifices.
- (10) V. supra 8a.
- (11) I.e., outside the Temple court.
- (12) Here the altar.
- (13) Cf. supra 71a and b.
- (14) If they ascend, they do not descend.
- (15) Chief of the priests and deputy High Priest; v. Sanh. (Sonc. ed.) p. 97, n. 1.
- (16) Lit., ‘in its place’.
- (17) Lev. VI, 2.

Zevachim 84b

and excludes, I include the former, because their disqualification arose in the sanctuary, while I exclude the latter whose disqualification did not arise in the sanctuary.¹

But R. Judah infers [the law] from the following: Why did they say that if blood is kept overnight it is fit? Because if the emurim are kept overnight they are fit. Why are the emurim fit if they are kept overnight? Because flesh is fit if kept overnight. [Flesh that] goes out? Because [flesh that] goes out is fit at the high place [Bamah]. Unclean [flesh]? Because it was permitted in public service. [The emurim of a sacrifice intended

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

to be burnt] after time? Because it propitiates in respect of its Piggul status. [The emurim of a sacrifice intended to be burnt] out of bounds? Because it was likened to [the intention to burn it] after time. Where unfit [persons] received [the blood] and sprinkled it — in the case of those unfit persons who are eligible for public service. Can you then argue from what is its proper way to that where the same is not the proper way? — The Tanna relies on the extension indicated by, This is the law of the burnt-offering.²

R. Johanan said: If one slaughters an animal at night within³ and offers it⁴ without,⁵ he is culpable:⁶

- (1) For notes v. supra 27b.
- (2) Lev. VI, 2. For notes v. supra 51a.
- (3) The Temple court.
- (4) Lit., ‘carries up’ (its limbs).
- (5) The Temple court; he offers it up by laying it on a stone or on an altar-like pile (v. Sifra on Lev. XVII, 6).
- (6) On account of laying limbs sacrificially without, even according to R. Judah who maintained that if it ascended the altar it must still descend. Those which if laid on the altar do not descend certainly render the priest culpable if he lays them without, since these can be received by the altar (v. infra 111b).

Zevachim 85a

let this not be less than slaughtering without and offering up [the limbs without¹]. R. Hiyya b. Abin raised an objection: One who slaughters a bird within and offers it up without is not culpable; if he slaughtered [it] without and offered it up without, he is culpable. Yet let us say: Let it not be less than slaughtering and offering up without? — That is a refutation. Alternatively, The slaughtering of a bird within is mere killing.²

‘Ulla said: If the emurim of lesser sacrifices are laid [on the altar] before their blood is sprinkled, they do not descend, [because] they have become the food of the altar. R. Zera observed, We too learnt [likewise]: THAT... WHOSE BLOOD WAS SPILT OR WHOSE

BLOOD PASSED WITHOUT THE HANGINGS: If you say there that if [the limbs or emurim] ascended they do not descend, though if he [the priest] should come to sprinkle, he has nothing to sprinkle;³ how much more so here, seeing that if he comes to sprinkle, he has what to sprinkle! — [No:] relate this to a most sacred sacrifice.⁴ But there is the Passover-offering, which is a lesser sacrifice?⁵ — Relate this to [where it is slaughtered] under a different designation.⁶

We learnt: AND ALL OF THESE, IF THEY ASCENDED THE ALTAR WHILST ALIVE, MUST DESCEND. Hence [if they ascended] when slaughtered, they do not descend: surely that is so whether they are most sacred sacrifices or lesser sacrifices? — No: [deduce thus:] but if they are slaughtered, some of these must descend,⁷ and some do not descend. But he teaches, AND ALL OF THESE. — That refers to whilst alive. That is obvious?⁸ — In truth it refers to living animals which have a cataract in the eye, this being in accordance with R. Akiba who maintained that if these ascend they do not descend.⁹ How have you explained it? As referring to unfit [animals]! Then consider the final clause: IF A BURNT-OFFERING WENT UP ALIVE TO THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, IT MUST DESCEND. IF ONE SLAUGHTERED IT ON THE TOP OF THE ALTAR, HE MUST FLAY IT AND DISMEMBER IT WHERE IT LIES. But if it is unfit, can it be flayed and dismembered? Surely the Divine Law said: And he shall cut it into pieces,¹⁰ ‘it’ [implies] a fit; but not an unfit [animal]? — The final clause refers to a fit [sacrifice]; and what does he [the Tanna] inform us?¹¹ that flaying and dismembering can be done on top of the altar. Then on the view that flaying and dismembering cannot be done on top of the altar, what can be said?—

The case we discuss here is, e.g., where it had a period of fitness and then became disqualified,¹² this agreeing with R. Eleazar

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

son of R. Simeon who maintained: Since the blood was sprinkled and the flesh had become acceptable¹³ even for a single hour, he must flay it, and its skin belongs to the priests.¹⁴ If so, when it was taught: ‘What does he do?¹⁵ He takes down the inwards and washes them’, why should he do so?¹⁶ — What then should we do? Offer [i.e. burn] them with their dung? ‘Present it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee? or will he accept thy person?’¹⁷ This is our difficulty: why must he wash them?¹⁸ — So that if another priest chances upon them and does not know,¹⁹ he will take them up.

- (1) Where one is culpable for each act separately.
- (2) Not ritual slaughtering (shechitah), since it requires melikah (v. Glos.). For that reason he is not culpable. But when he slaughters an animal sacrifice at night, it does count as shechitah (since hullin may be slaughtered at night).
- (3) Since the blood is spilt.
- (4) The Mishnah may refer to most sacred sacrifices only, whose emurim are intrinsically holy even before the blood is sprinkled. Possibly, however, the same does not apply to lesser sacrifices, whose emurim are sacred only in virtue of the sprinkling of the blood.
- (5) The Mishnah enumerates this too, and it is now assumed that this law applies even where its blood is spilt.
- (6) As the Mishnah actually states. It does not apply, however, to the present instance.
- (7) Sc. lesser sacrifices.
- (8) Obviously they cannot remain there but must be brought down and slaughtered, and then they will be taken up again. If then this is not taught for the sake of the inference (viz., that all of these, if slaughtered, do not descend), it is altogether superfluous.
- (9) V. supra 77b. The Mishnah thus informs us that they must descend, and even if subsequently slaughtered they may not re-ascend.
- (10) Lev. I, 6.
- (11) If it is fit, it obviously descends, since it will be taken up again.
- (12) It refers indeed to a fit animal which ascended alive, but after it was slaughtered on top of the altar and its blood was sprinkled, it became disqualified; therefore it must be flayed and dismembered on top of the altar, for if it is taken down it may not be taken up again, since it was disqualified. And as to the objection that an unfit animal cannot be flayed, the answer is

that it had a period when it was fit for flaying before it became disqualified.

(13) This is a technical term denoting that the flesh was now fit for its purpose.

(14) Even if it became unfit after the sprinkling of the blood. Though the flesh cannot be burnt on the altar but in the place of burning unfit sacrifices, the skin is not burnt with it but belongs to the priests. So here too, when it is on top of the altar it must likewise be flayed and dismembered.

(15) In this case where an animal ascended the altar whilst alive and it was slaughtered there.

(16) Seeing that they are unfit. For though these unfit animals must not be taken down, yet if they are, they may not be taken up again.

(17) Mal. I, 8. This is a protest against offering anything unseemly, and it is most unseemly to offer the inwards uncleaned.

(18) Since they must be taken down, after which they cannot go up again, let them be left as they are.

(19) That they are unfit.

Zevachim 85b

And shall we arise and do a thing to priests whereby they may come to a stumbling block?¹ — Even so it is better, that Divine sacrifices should not lie like carrion.²

R. Hiyya b. Abba said: R. Johanan asked: If the emurim of lesser sacrifices were taken up before their blood was sprinkled, must they go down or not? Said R. Ammi to him: Then inquire about a trespass-offering?³ — I do not ask about a trespass-offering, he replied, because sprinkling alone makes it subject to a trespass-offering; I only ask about [their] going down. And he [eventually] ruled that they do not go down and do not involve trespass.

R. Nahman b. Isaac recited it thus. R. Hiyya b. Abba said, R. Johanan asked: If the emurim of lesser sacrifices were taken up before their blood was sprinkled, do they involve a trespass-offering or not? Said R. Ammi to him: Then ask about [their] going down? I do not ask about going down, he replied, because they have become the food of the altar;⁴ I ask only about a trespass-

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

offering. And [eventually] he ruled: They do not go down and do not involve trespass.

THE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE FOLLOWING DID NOT ARISE IN THE SANCTUARY, etc. R. Johanan said: Only in the case of cataracts in the eye did R. Akiba declare them fit, since such are fit in the case of birds, and provided that their consecration [for a sacrifice] preceded their blemish. And R. Akiba admits in the case of a female burnt-offering [that it must be taken down], because that is tantamount to the blemish preceding its consecration.⁵

R. Jeremiah asked: Is nirba' [a disqualification] in birds or is nirba' no [disqualification] in birds?⁶ Do we say: [Ye shall bring your offering] of the cattel excludes roba' and nirba': [hence] whatever is subject to [the disqualification of] roba' is subject to [the disqualification of] nirba'; and whatever is not subject to roba' is not subject to nirba'.⁸ Or perhaps, sin has been committed with it?⁹ —

Said Raba, Come and hear: R. AKIBA DECLARED BLEMISHED ANIMALS FIT. Now, if this is correct,¹⁰ let him also declare a nirba' fit,¹¹ since it is fit in the case of birds.¹² Hence infer from this [that it is not fit]. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We too have learnt thus: With regard to a nirba', a bird set apart [for an idolatrous sacrifice], a bird worshipped, a [harlot's] hire, the price [of a dog], a tumtum¹³ and a hermaphrodite, all of these defile garments when they are in the gullet.¹⁴ This proves it.

R. HANINA THE SEGAN OF THE PRIESTS. What does he inform us? — I can say that he informs us of the actual fact.¹⁵ Alternatively, what does HE REPULSED mean? Indirectly.¹⁶

JUST AS THEY DO NOT DESCEND IF THEY ONCE ASCENDED, etc. 'Ulla said: They learnt this only where the fire had not

taken hold of it; but if the fire had taken hold of it, it must re-ascend. R. Mari recited this in connection with the first clause.¹⁷ R. Hanina of Sura recited it in connection with the final clause:¹⁸ With regard to the bones, tendons, horns and hoofs, if they are attached [to the animal], they ascend [the altar]; if they are severed [from the animal] they do not ascend.¹⁹ Said 'Ulla: They learnt this only where the fire had not taken hold of them; but if the fire had taken hold of them, they ascend.²⁰ He who recites it in connection with the final clause [holds that it applies] all the more to the first clause.²¹ He however who recites it in connection with the first clause [maintains]: but as for the final clause, those things are not normally burnt [on the altar].²²

MISHNAH. THE FOLLOWING IF THEY ASCENDED GO DOWN:²³ THE FLESH OF MOST SACRED SACRIFICES AND THE FLESH OF LESSER SACRIFICES; THE RESIDUE OF THE 'OMER;²⁴ THE TWO LOAVES;²⁵ THE SHEWBREAD;²⁶ THE RESIDUE OF MEAL-OFFERINGS;²⁷ AND INCENSE.²⁸ THE WOOL ON THE HEADS OF LAMBS, THE HAIR OF HE-GOATS BEARDS; THE BONES, TENDONS, HORNS AND HOOFS, IF THEY ARE ATTACHED, GO UP, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, AND THE PRIEST SHALL MAKE THE WHOLE SMOKE ON THE ALTAR;²⁹ IF THEY ARE SEVERED [FROM THE ANIMAL], THEY DO NOT GO UP, FOR IT IS SAID, AND THOU SHALT OFFER THY BURNT-OFFERINGS, THE FLESH AND THE BLOOD, [UPON THE ALTAR OF THE LORD THY GOD]].³⁰

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught : And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar: this includes the bones, tendons, horns and hoofs. You might think, even if they were severed; therefore it states, 'And thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood'. If [we had only the text] flesh and blood [to go by],

(1) Surely we may not cause another priest to think that they are fit.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

- (2) Hence they must be washed.
- (3) If one misappropriates sacred property to secular use he is liable to a trespass-offering. Normally when emurim are laid on the altar (after the sprinkling of the blood) they become the property of the altar, and anyone thus misappropriating them incurs a trespass-offering. Then let the question be asked: does the law of trespass apply if they were taken up before the sprinkling of the blood?
- (4) V. supra a.
- (5) For notes v. supra 35b.
- (6) There is no question about roba', as a male bird does not copulate with a woman.
- (7) Lev. I, 2. 'Of' (Heb. ׀) is partitive, and regarded as a limitation.
- (8) So that it does not disqualify a bird.
- (9) Hence it is disqualified.
- (10) That nirba' does not disqualify a bird.
- (11) Sc. an animal, in the sense that it does not descend.
- (12) Even to sacrifice such in the first place.
- (13) An animal or bird whose genitals are covered up, so that its sex cannot be determined. — This passage refers to birds.
- (14) V. p. 257, n. 1. This proves that nirba' is a disqualification.
- (15) What happened in such cases.
- (16) Not openly, as this would seem to degrade sacrifices, but covertly. Lit., 'as with the back of the hand'.
- (17) The present Mishnah, referring to unfit animals.
- (18) The next Mishnah.
- (19) And if they did, they must be removed.
- (20) Even if taken down.
- (21) Because the first clause deals with things that are normally burnt on the altar.
- (22) Therefore even if the fire had taken hold of them, they are taken down, since they have no connection with the altar at all.
- (23) Because they do not belong to the altar at all.
- (24) The 'omer (q.v. Glos.) after it was waved; v. Lev. XXIII, 20 seq.
- (25) V. Lev. XXIII, 15 seq.
- (26) V. Ex. XXV, 30.
- (27) V. Lev. II, 2 seq.
- (28) Which must be burnt on the inner altar.
- (29) Lev. I, 9.
- (30) Deut. XII, 27.

Zevachim 86a

you might have thought that one must remove the tendons and bones and lay [only] flesh on the altar; therefore it says, 'And the priest

shall make the whole smoke'. How are these text reconciled? If they are attached, they ascend; if they are severed, even if they are on the top of the altar, they must go down. Which Tanna do you know to maintain that if they were severed, they must go down? It is Rabbi. For it was taught: 'And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar': this includes the bones, tendons, horns and hoofs, even if they were severed. How do then I interpret, 'And thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood'? It is to teach you: Burnt pieces [flesh] of the burnt-offering you must replace [on the altar],¹ but you do not replace burnt tendons and bones. Rabbi said: One text states, 'And the priest shall make the whole smoke on the altar', thus extending [the law], while another text states, 'And thou shalt offer thy burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood', thus limiting [it]. How do you reconcile them? If they are attached, they ascend; if they are severed, even if they are on the top of the altar, they descend.

IF THEY ARE SEVERED [FROM THE ANIMAL], THEY DO NOT GO UP, etc. R. Zera said: They learnt this only if they were severed downwards;² but [if they were severed] upwards,³ they come nearer to being burnt.⁴ Even if they were severed?⁵ —

Said Rabbah: This is what he means: They learnt this only if they were severed after sprinkling;⁶ but if they were severed before sprinkling, the sprinkling comes and makes them permitted [for general use], even to make from them a knife handle.⁷ He holds as R. Johanan said on R. Ishmael's authority: 'It shall be his' [the priest's] is said of the burnt-offering, and 'it shall be his' is said of the guilt-offering;⁸ as the bones of a guilt-offering are permitted, for even its flesh is permitted to the priests, so are the bones of a burnt-offering permitted. This must be redundant,⁹ for if it is not redundant, you can refute [the deduction]: as for a guilt-offering, the reason is because its flesh is permitted.¹⁰ [It is

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

redundant, for] a superfluous ‘it shall be his’ is written.¹¹

R. Adda b. Ahaba raised an objection: The bones of sacrifices involve trespass¹² before sprinkling, but do not involve trespass after sprinkling; whereas the bones of a burnt-offering always involve trespass?¹³ — Say: Whereas those of a burnt-offering, if they were severed before sprinkling, involve trespass until the sprinkling; [if they were severed] after sprinkling, they always involve trespass.¹⁴ Now he [Rabbah] disagrees with R. Eleazar. For R. Eleazar said: If they were severed before sprinkling, they involve trespass; after sprinkling, one must not use them,¹⁵ but they do not involve trespass.¹⁶

MISHNAH. AND IF ANY OF THESE¹⁷ SPRANG OFF FROM THE ALTAR¹⁸ THEY ARE NOT REPLACED. SIMILARLY, IF A COAL SPRANG OFF FROM THE ALTAR, IT IS NOT REPLACED. LIMBS THAT SPRANG OFF FROM THE ALTAR: IF BEFORE MIDNIGHT, MUST BE REPLACED, AND INVOLVE TRESPASS; AFTER MIDNIGHT, THEY ARE NOT REPLACED AND DO NOT INVOLVE TRESPASS. JUST AS THE ALTAR SANCTIFIES WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR IT, SO DOES THE ASCENT SANCTIFY WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR IT;¹⁹ AND JUST AS THE ALTAR AND THE ASCENT SANCTIFY WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THEM, SO DO VESSELS SANCTIFY.²⁰

GEMARA. How is it meant? If they have substance,²¹ then even after midnight too [let them be returned]; while if they have no substance, even before midnight too [they need] not [be returned]? — This holds good only

- (1) If they sprang off.
- (2) Away from the burning pile. Then they do not go up, and if they did, they are removed. — They were placed on the altar, of course, whilst attached to the flesh.
- (3) Springing nearer to the centre of the pile.

(4) They are not removed. — This passage is thus apparently based on the Mishnah . Tosaf. however points out that the Mishnah discusses whether they are to be placed on the altar at all, whereas this assumes that it was already there. Accordingly Tosaf. explains that it refers to the Baraita just quoted, where the first Tanna maintains that the bones, etc. are included even if they are severed.

(5) The meaning of this is doubtful, and Rashi assumes that there is a lacuna in the text. If the text is correct, the meaning would be: do you say that even if they were severed (upwards) they remain on the altar; surely the Mishnah teaches that only when attached do they ascend? Sh. M. quotes a variant reading: It was stated above: this includes the bones, etc. even if they were severed. Said Rabbah: They learnt this only, etc.

(6) Then they must descend, nevertheless they are still regarded as sacred, and must be so treated.

(7) I.e., they have no sanctity at all.

(8) Lev. VII, 7f.

(9) Lit., ‘free’, ‘disengaged.’ The form of exegesis just used, based on the fact that the same words are used of both, is called a *gezerah shawah*, and in such the word used as a basis of deduction must be entirely free for that purpose, being otherwise redundant.

(10) Hence its bones are too. Whereas the flesh of a burnt-offering must be burnt on the altar, and so its bones too may be forbidden.

(11) Scripture could write, the skin of the burnt-offering... shall be the priest's.

(12) V. p. 405, n. 8.

(13) This proves that they are always forbidden.

(14) Emended text (Sh.M.).

(15) By Rabbinical law.

(16) This agrees with R. Ishmael supra. When he quotes ‘it shall be his’ it must mean after sprinkling, for it is the sprinkling that permits the flesh (and so the bones too, on his view) to the priests.

(17) The unfit and bones, etc. which if laid on the altar must not be removed.

(18) Through the heat.

(19) If laid on the ascent, it must not be removed.

(20) Sc. service-vessels — they sanctify what is placed in them.

(21) If these limbs are not burnt right through and the flesh is recognizable.

Zevachim 86b

of hardened [limbs].¹ Whence do we know it?² — Said Raba: One text states, [This is the law of the burnt-offering: it is that which goeth up

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

on its firewood upon the altar] all night... and he shall burn thereon, etc.³ Whereas another text states, all night... and he shall take up the ashes.⁴ How are these texts reconciled?⁵ Divide it [the night]: half is for burning, and half for taking up [the ashes].⁶

R. Kahana raised an objection: Every day he [the priest] takes up [the ashes]⁷ at cockcrow, or slightly before or slightly after. On the Day of Atonement, [he does this] at midnight; on festivals, at the first watch.⁸ If then you maintain that [the altar must be cleared] from midnight [onwards], how may we advance it? — Said R. Johanan: From the implication of ‘all night’, do I not know that it is until the morning? Why then is ‘unto the morning’ stated? Add another morning to the morning of the night.⁹ Therefore every day it is sufficient from cockcrow. On the Day of Atonement [it is done] at midnight, on account of the fatigue¹⁰ of the High Priest.¹¹ On festivals when there were many sacrifices and so the Israelites came very early, [it was done] at the first watch, as the sequel teaches: and before cockcrow the Temple court was full of Israelites. It was stated: If they sprang off¹² before midnight and he replaced them after midnight: Rabbah said:

(1) The fire had hardened them and completely dried up all their natural moisture, yet had not turned them into charred coals.

(2) That the matter depends on midnight.

(3) Lev. VI, 2-5. The combination of these texts implies that ‘all night’ is meant in respect of burning.

(4) Ibid. 3. He assumes that ‘and he shall take up the ashes’ also means during the night, (i.e., ‘all night’), since the whole verse reads: And the priest shall put on his linen garment... and he shall take up the ashes: as it does not say that he must don his linen garment in the morning, it is assumed that he did it at night and straightway took up the ashes. Thus this contradicts the implication of the first verse.

(5) Emended text (Sh.M.).

(6) The first half is for burning, and during this time the flesh is not considered completely consumed unless it has actually been turned into ashes. The second half is for clearing, in the sense that even before the flesh has actually become

ashes but has merely reached the stage of hardness it is regarded as ashes. If, however, it still retains the softness of flesh, it is obviously not ashes, and must not be removed.

(7) A shovelful of ashes which were placed at the east side of the ascent.

(8) Yoma 20a. The night (roughly from 6 P.M. to 6 A.M.) was divided into three or four watches (the matter is debated in Ber. 3a). The end of the first watch would be about 9 or 10 P.M., two or three hours before midnight.

(9) The morning of the night is dawn, while the additional morning is any earlier hour when the priests might rise to commence the service, according to the exigencies of the day. Since this is not fixed, it can be put forward or deferred as may be necessary.

(10) Lit., ‘weakness’.

(11) To enable him to rest after it until the morning burnt-offering. This assumes that the High Priest removed the ashes himself. Tosaf. however suggests that it may mean that the ashes were removed (by another priest) earlier to enable the wood pile to be arranged and likewise the other rites to be performed as early as possible, so that the High Priest could sacrifice the daily burnt-offering at dawn, before he was hungry and fatigued.

(12) Lit., ‘separated’.

Zevachim 87a

The second midnight consumes them.¹ R. Hisda said: The dawn consumes them. The scholars of the Academy said: What is R. Hisda's reason? If midnight, which does not establish linah,² establishes ‘ikul;³ then dawn, which establishes linah, surely establishes ‘ikul. If they sprang off before midnight and he replaced them after dawn,—

Rabbah said: The second midnight consumes them; R. Hisda said: They never reach ‘ikul.⁴ To this R. Joseph demurred: And who is to tell us that midnight establishes ‘ikul [only when they are] on the top of the altar; perhaps it establishes ‘ikul wherever they are? They sent from thence:⁵ The law agrees with R. Joseph.⁶ It was stated likewise: R. Hiyya b. Abba said: If they sprang off before midnight and were replaced after midnight, you may not use them, nor do you commit trespass on their account.⁷ Bar Kappara taught likewise: If they sprang off before

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

midnight and were replaced after midnight, they are not subject to trespass. R. Papa asked Abaye: Now, since they sent from there [that] the law agrees with R. Joseph, and R. Hiyya b. Abba said [the same], and Bar Kappara taught likewise, wherein do Rabbah and R. Hisda disagree? — In the case of fat [limbs], he answered him.⁸

Raba asked Rabbah: Is linah effective [when the limbs are] on the top of the altar, or is it not effective on top of the altar? — What are the circumstances: if we say that they [the limbs] did not descend,⁹ surely since you say that even if they were kept overnight in the Temple court they do not descend,¹⁰ can there be a question [when they are kept on] the top of the altar?¹¹ Rather [the question is] where they descended. Do we liken it to the Table, for we learnt: Even if they¹² are on the Table many days, it does not matter? Or perhaps we liken it to the pavement of the Temple court?¹³ — Said he to him: Linah is not [effective when the flesh is] on the top of the altar. Did he accept [this ruling] from him or did he not accept it from him? —

Come and hear. For it was stated: Limbs which spent the night in the Temple court, [the priest] can go on burning them all night;¹⁴ if they were kept overnight on the top of the altar, he can always go on burning them.¹⁵ If they descended: Rabbah said: They re-ascend; Raba said: They do not re-ascend.¹⁶ This proves that he did not accept [the ruling] from him. This proves it.

JUST AS THE ALTAR SANCTIFIES, etc. Our Rabbis taught: Whatsoever touches the altar [shall be holy]:¹⁷ I know it only of the altar; how do I know [it of] the ascent? Because it says, the [eth] altar.¹⁸ How do we know [it of] service vessels? Because it says: Whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.¹⁹

Resh Lakish asked R. Johanan: Do the service vessels sanctify the disqualified? —

We have learnt it, he replied: **JUST AS THE ALTAR AND THE ASCENT SANCTIFY WHATEVER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THEM, SO DO VESSELS SANCTIFY!**²⁰ Said he, My question is whether they can be offered in the first place. But that too we have learnt:

(1) They will not be assumed to reach the stage of hardness (v. supra 86b) until the following midnight; unless, of course, they are reduced to ashes before then.

(2) The status of flesh that is kept overnight. Midnight does not confer that status, and flesh that falls off after midnight is replaced on the altar.

(3) Lit. 'burning,' 'consumption'. If the flesh is hard by midnight (v. supra 86b top) it is regarded as consumed, and if it springs off after that it is not replaced.

(4) Whenever they spring off, until they are actually ashes, they must be replaced, and involve trespass.

(5) Sc. from Palestine — The reference is to R. Eleazar (v. Sanh. 17b).

(6) His argument is correct. — Actually they did not give a ruling (Tosaf).

(7) They need not have been replaced, as they no longer belong to the altar. Hence they do not involve trespass; nevertheless, benefit from them is interdicted by Rabbinical law.

(8) Even when they harden they are not regarded as consumed ('ikul), because their fat keeps them from becoming ashes. Only then do Rabbah and R. Hisda disagree as to their status. But in the case of ordinary flesh they agree that midnight establishes 'ikul.

(9) But remained on the altar, away from the fresh wood pile for the new sacrifices.

(10) If placed on the altar after the night passed.

(11) Surely they do not descend.

(12) The loaves of the Showbread.

(13) Hence it becomes unfit.

(14) But not after, for linah disqualifies them.

(15) They are never disqualified as long as they are there.

(16) Because linah disqualifies them, and so like all disqualified limbs they do not re-ascend once they descended.

(17) Ex. XXIX, 37.

(18) The reference is probably either to XXIX, 44: And I will sanctify the tent of meeting, and the altar; or to XXX, 26-28: And thou shalt anoint therewith... the altar of burnt-offering. In either case the preceding eth (which denotes the acc.) is regarded as an extension, thus including the ascent.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(19) Ibid. XXX, 29. 'Them' refers (among other things) to service vessels, which are spoken of in the preceding verses.

(20) The reference being to disqualified sacrificial parts. V. Mishnah notes.

Zevachim 87b

[Or] where unfit [persons] received and sprinkled the blood.¹ Surely that means, where unfit [persons] received and sprinkled the blood.² — No: [it may mean] that unfit [persons] received it or unfit persons sprinkled the blood.³

The scholars asked:⁴ Is the air-space above the altar as the altar, or not?⁵ — Come and hear: **JUST AS THE ALTAR SANCTIFIES SO DOES THE ASCENT SANCTIFY.** Now, if you say that the airspace above the altar is not as the altar, then the air-space above the ascent too is not as the ascent; how then can one carry it up from the ascent to the altar, seeing that it is as having descended?⁶ — He drags it.⁷ But there was a gap between the ascent and the altar?⁸ — When the greater part of it [the limb] is nearer the ascent, it is as though it were [on] the ascent, and when the greater part of it is nearer the altar, it is as though it were on the altar. Then from this you can solve Rami b. Hama's question, [viz.]: Is there a connective in [limbs which] ascend the altar or not?⁹ Solve that there is a connective?¹⁰ — That is no difficulty: Then solve it!

Raba son of R. Hanan demurred: If you say that the air-space above the altar is as the altar, how is it possible for a burnt-offering of a bird to be disqualified through an [illegitimate] intention; surely the altar has received it?¹¹ R. Shimi b. Ashi demurred: Why not? It is possible e.g., where he declared: Behold, I pinch it intending to take it off to-morrow [from the altar], then carry it up again and burn it.¹² (That is well according to Raba who maintained [that] linah is effective [when the sacrifice is] on top of the

altar; but according to Rabbah who held that linah is not effective on top of the altar, his intention [certainly] does not count!¹³ — According to Rabbah too it is possible e.g. if he declared: Behold, I pinch it with the intention of taking it down before dawn and taking it up again after dawn.)¹⁴ At all events, you can solve [the question] in the other direction, viz., that the air-space of the altar is as the altar,¹⁵ for should you think that the air-space of an altar is not as the altar,

(1) V. supra 84a.

(2) The 'and' (Heb. 7) being conjunctive. This implies that only then do they not descend once they ascended, which further implies that they may not ascend in the first place. Hence, if unfit persons received the blood (naturally, in a service vessel) whilst fit persons sprinkled it, they may ascend (be offered) in the first place, and that must be because the vessels sanctified the blood to permit its sprinkling at the outset.

(3) And we are informed that even then the limbs do not descend once they ascended, notwithstanding that they were disqualified by the sprinkling.

(4) Emended text (Sh.M.).

(5) If one suspends disqualified limbs above the altar, is it as though they are on the altar itself and must not be removed, or not?

(6) For if it is not as the ascent, when he lifts it up to carry to the altar it is as though he had taken it down, and we learnt that if it descended it must not re-ascend.

(7) Up to the altar without lifting it up from the ascent.

(8) V. supra 62b. And when the limbs reach the gap, they are as though taken down.

(9) If the smaller part of a limb springs off, is it considered as still attached to the whole, and so must be replaced, or not?

(10) For otherwise each portion of the limb becomes disqualified as it enters the gap between the altar and the ascent.

(11) The neck of a burnt-offering of a bird was pinched (v. Lev. I, 15) on top of the altar, i.e., in the air-space above the altar. Now if the priest actually kept it suspended in the air-space above the altar until the next day it would be fit then for ritual burning, for disqualified sacrifices do not descend once they ascended (i.e., even if linah does disqualify when the sacrifice is on the altar). Since then it is fit for burning on the morrow, why should the intention to burn it on the morrow

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

disqualify it, seeing that at the very moment that it is killed it is as though laid on the altar?

(12) This would be forbidden, as if it descended it does not re-ascend. Hence the intention too can disqualify it.

(13) For even if he kept it until the morrow on the top of the altar it would not be disqualified, so that if he took it down then he would still have to replace it. The intention to do this would certainly not disqualify it.

(14) If the sacrifice were actually on the ground at dawn it would be disqualified, and so the intention too disqualifies it.

(15) This is the conclusion of R. Shimi b. Ashi's argument: though R. Hanan's reasoning is faulty, yet one can argue in the reverse direction.

Zevachim 88a

how may one sprinkle the blood of a disqualified sin-offering of a bird, as it has the status of having descended,¹ [and] how could one sprinkle the blood of other disqualified [sacrifices]?² — He contacts [the blood] [with the wall of the altar].³ Is that haza'ah? it is draining; is that zerikah? it is pouring out;⁴ moreover, is that the way of haza'ah and zerikah?⁵ — Said R. Ashi: If he held it on top of the altar, that would indeed be so; the question arises where he [the priest] stands on the ground and suspends it [the blood] on a cane?⁶ what then? The question stands over.

MISHNAH. THE VESSELS FOR LIQUIDS SANCTIFY LIQUIDS,⁷ AND THE MEASURES FOR DRY MATTER SANCTIFY DRY MATTER.⁸ A LIQUID VESSEL DOES NOT SANCTIFY DRY MATTER, NOR DOES A DRY [MEASURE] SANCTIFY A LIQUID. IF HOLY VESSELS WERE PERFORATED AND THEY CAN BE USED FOR THE SAME PURPOSE AS WHEN WHOLE, THEY SANCTIFY [WHAT IS PLACED IN THEM]; IF NOT, THEY DO NOT SANCTIFY. AND ALL THESE SANCTIFY ONLY IN THE SANCTUARY.⁹

GEMARA. Samuel said: They learnt [this] only of the measures,¹⁰ but the basins sanctified,¹¹ for it is said: Both of them filled with fine flour.¹² Said R. Aha of Difti to Rabina: But that was a moist meal-offering?¹³

— He replied, The proof is from the dry parts thereof.¹⁴ Alternatively, a meal-offering is dry in comparison with blood.¹⁵ Samuel said. The service vessels sanctified only when whole, full,¹⁶ and through the inside.¹⁷ Others state it: They sanctify only when whole, full, and within.¹⁸ Wherein do they differ? — They differ in respect of the overflow of measures.¹⁹ In a Baraitha it was taught: They sanctify only when full, whole, through the inside and within. R. Assi said in R. Johanan's name: They learnt this²⁰ only where he [the priest] does not intend to add thereto; but if he intends adding thereto, each portion becomes holy in turn.²¹ It was taught likewise: [Both of them] filled [with fine flour]: 'filled' means complete.²² Said R. Jose: When is that? When he does not intend to add [thereto]; but if he intends to add [thereto], each portion becomes holy in turn.

A LIQUID VESSEL DOES NOT SANCTIFY, etc. Rab-others state R. Assi-said: They do not sanctify to be offered, but they sanctify [it] to be disqualified.²³ Others recite it in connection with the following: You may not bring meal-offerings, drink-offerings, and the meal-offering of an animal [sacrifice], or the first-fruits,²⁴ from a mixture;²⁵ and it goes without saying from 'orlah and kil'ayim of the vineyard.²⁶ If one did bring [such], it is not sanctified. Said Rab — others state, R. Assi — : It is not sanctified to be offered, but it is sanctified to be disqualified.²⁷

Our Rabbis taught: When holy vessels are perforated, you may not melt them²⁸ nor melt lead into them.²⁹ If they were damaged,³⁰ you may not repair them. If a knife was damaged, you may not smooth out the damage;³¹ if it slipped out [of its haft], you may not replace it. Abba Saul said: There was a knife which caused terefoth³² in the Temple, whereupon the priests decided by vote to hide it.

Our Rabbis taught: The priestly garments were not sewn but woven,³³ as it is said, of

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

woven work.³⁴ If soiled, they might not be washed with natron³⁵ or with ahal.³⁶ But you may wash them in water?³⁷ — Said Abaye, This is what he means: If they [merely] needed water,³⁸ you may wash them [even] with natron or ahal.

(1) If one pinched the bird on the altar with an illegitimate intention, it is disqualified; as soon as he lifts it in order to sprinkle the blood, it is as though he had taken it down from the altar, and such may not be taken up again. Hence the blood could not be sprinkled.

(2) According to R. Gamaliel who maintains that if the blood of disqualified sacrifices ascended the altar, it must not descend. But sprinkling is done from a distance, so that the blood passes through the air-space of the altar.

(3) Not from the distance.

(4) Haza'ah and zerikah are two words for sprinkling, the latter denoting a sprinkling with greater force than the former. — If he does not sprinkle the blood from the distance, it is not sprinkling at all.

(5) Even if this could be called sprinkling, it is certainly not the manner in which sprinkling is done.

(6) The above argument proves nothing. For when the man stands on the altar and holds the blood or the bird in his hand, the air-space is certainly as the altar itself, for the fact that he is standing on it gives the blood, etc. the same status as though it were on the altar.

(7) E.g. the plates and basins for blood, wine and oil.

(8) There were two dry measures, an 'issaron (tenth part of an ephah) and half an 'issaron: the first was used for measuring all meal-offerings, while the second was used for the High Priest's daily morning and evening meal-offerings (v. Lev. VI, 12 seq.).-Rashi and Tosaf. give different reasons why the Mishnah speaks of liquid vessels and dry measures.

(9) The Temple court.

(10) Only the liquid measures, of which there were seven, do not sanctify dry matter. The reason is because these were only fit for measuring, and had been anointed (whereby they were sanctified) for this purpose only.

(11) Though meant primarily for liquids, they could also be used for meal.

(12) Num. VII, 13. 'Both' included a basin, which was normally used for liquids.

(13) V. *ibid.*: with fine flour mingled with oil for a meal-offering.

(14) Lit., 'it is necessary only for the dry parts'. — Mingling could not be so thorough as to leave no

dry parts at all, yet these too were sanctified by the basins.

(15) For which the basins were normally used.

(16) They must contain as much as is required, e.g., if flour for a meal-offering is placed in them, there must be at least an 'issaron.

(17) But if flour is heaped up on the outside of a service vessel, it is not sanctified.

(18) Rashi: in the Temple court.

(19) When a measure is overfilled, so that there is a brim, the Rabbis disagree as to whether the overflow is sanctified (Men. 90a). He who maintains that only the inside sanctifies, holds that the overflow is not sanctified.

(20) That it sanctifies only when full.

(21) Lit., 'the first, the first is holy'. Every little quantity is sanctified as it is poured into the vessel, and it remains sanctified even if it was not full eventually.

(22) Containing the necessary measure (v. n. 10, p. 416); only then is it sanctified.

(23) If meal is placed in a liquid vessel, it is sanctified in so far that if it is then carried out of the Temple court or touched by a Tebul Yom (q.v. *Glos.*), it is disqualified from being used henceforth for a meal-offering.

(24) I.e., which accompanied an animal sacrifice or the first-fruits.

(25) A mixture of terumah and hullin.

(26) V. *Glos.* and Deut. XXII, 9. A meal-offering or drink-offering can certainly not be brought from these, which are forbidden to all, including priests. But it may not be brought even from a mixture of terumah and hullin, which is permitted to priests, though priests consume the meal-offering, because what is brought must be permitted to all.

(27) It does not count simply as hullin but as sanctified meal which had become unfit, having been sanctified by the service-vessel in which it was placed, and therefore it must be burnt.

(28) I.e., melt the metal around the hole to close it up.

(29) For the same purpose.

(30) More extensively.

(31) I.e., if the edge is heavily notched it may not be re-ground.

(32) It frequently became slightly notched and was inadvertently used, thus making the sacrifices Terefah. — Terefoth is used loosely for Nebeloth.

(33) They were woven directly into garments, not first into cloth and then sewn together.

(34) Ex. XXVIII, 32.

(35) V. Sanh. (Sonc. ed.) p. 330, n. 5.

(36) A substance used as soap. — The reason for all these is that it savors of poverty to repair or cleanse them for Temple use.

(37) Surely not; that too savors of poverty and is moreover inefficient.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(38) Lit ,‘if they were brought to water.’ — i.e., they were only slightly soiled.

Zevachim 88b

If they needed natron or ahal, you may not wash them even in water. Others maintain: You may not wash them at all,¹ because there is no poverty in the place of wealth.

Our Rabbis taught: The robe [Me’il] was entirely of blue,² as it is said, And he made the robe of the ephod of woven work, all of blue.³ How were its skirts [made]? Blue [wool], purple wool and crimson thread, twisted together, were brought, and manufactured into the shape of pomegranates whose mouths were not yet opened⁴ and in the shape of the cones of the helmets on children's heads. Seventy two bells containing seventy two clappers were brought and hung thereon, thirty six on each

side.⁵ R. Dosa⁶ said on the authority of Rabbi Judah: There were thirty six, eighteen on each side. R. ‘Inyani b. Sason said: As there is a controversy here, so is there a controversy in respect to leprous plagues.⁷ For we learnt: The appearances of plagues, R. Dosa b. Harkinas said: They are thirty six; Akabia b. Mahalalel said: They are eighteen.⁸

R. ‘Inyani b. Sason also said: Why are the sections on sacrifices and the priestly vestments close together?⁹ To teach you: as sacrifices make atonement, so do the priestly vestments make atonement. The coat atones for bloodshed, for it is said, And they killed a he-goat, and dipped the coat in the blood.¹⁰ The breeches atoned for lewdness, as it is said, And thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover the flesh of their nakedness.¹¹ The miter made atonement for arrogance. How do we know it? —

Said R. Hanina: Let an article placed high up¹² come and atone for an offence of hauteur. The girdle atoned for [impure] meditations of the heart, i.e., where it was placed.¹³ The breastplate atoned for [neglect

of] civil laws, as it is said, And thou shalt make a breastplate of judgment.¹⁴ The ephod atoned for idolatry, as it is said, Without ephod there are teraphim.¹⁵ The robe atoned for slander. How do we know it? —

Said R. Hanina: Let an article of sound¹⁶ come and atone for an offence of sound. The head-plate atoned for brazenness: of the head-plate it is written, And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead,¹⁷ whilst of brazenness it is written, Yet thou hadst a harlot's forehead.¹⁸ But that is not so, for surely R. Joshua b. Levi said: For two things we find no atonement through sacrifices, but find atonement for them through something else,¹⁹ and they are bloodshed and slander. Bloodshed [is atoned for] by the beheaded heifer,²⁰ while slander [is atoned for] by incense. For R. Hanania recited: How do we know that incense atones? Because it is said, And he put on the incense, and made atonement for the people.²¹ And the school of R. Ishmael taught [likewise]: For what does incense atone? For slander: let that which is done in secret²² come and atone for an offence committed in secret.²³ Thus slander contradicts slander, and bloodshed contradicts bloodshed? —

There is no difficulty: bloodshed does not contradict bloodshed: In the one case the murderer is known,²⁴ in the other the murderer is unknown.²⁵ If the murderer is known, he is liable to death?²⁶ -It means [where he committed murder] deliberately, but was not warned.²⁷ Slander too does not contradict slander: Here it was done in secret;²⁸ there it was done in public.²⁹

(1) Even if slightly soiled.

(2) Tekeleth, wool dyed with a peculiar blue, now no longer obtainable.

(3) Ibid. XXXIX. 22.

(4) Override pomegranates open up slightly.

(5) I.e., in front and behind.

(6) Sh.M. reads: Rabbi.

(7) Lit., ‘the appearances of plagues’.

(8) They disagree as to how many colors render these plagues leprous and unclean.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(9) Immediately after discussing the burnt-offering, meal-offering, sin-offering, and peace-offerings (Lev. VII), Scripture speaks of the priestly garments (VIII, 1 seq.)

(10) Gen. XXXVII, 31. This was a sign that later the coat would make atonement, even as dipping (Heb. Tebillah, in later Hebrew denoting ritual immersion for purification) symbolized atonement.

(11) Ex. XXVIII, 42.

(12) On top of the head.

(13) It was placed at the level of the heart.

(14) Ibid., 15.

(15) Hos. III, 4. Where there is no ephod, there is the unatoned-for sin of Teraphim (idols). — E.V.: without ephod or Teraphim.

(16) Sc. the robe, which was fringed with bells.

(17) Ex. XXVIII, 38.

(18) Jer. III, 3.

(19) Lit., 'from another place.'

(20) V. Deut. XXI, 1-9.

(21) Num. XVII, 12.

(22) None was present when the incense was offered.

(23) Slander is first related in private and then it spreads.

(24) Then the coat makes atonement, so that the whole community should not be divinely punished.

(25) Then the beheaded heifer makes atonement.

(26) And until he is executed the community is not forgiven.

(27) On 'warning, (hathra'ah) v. p. 372, n. 1. He could not be executed in that case.

(28) Then the incense atones.

(29) Then the robe atones.

GEMARA. Whence do we know it? [You ask] Whence do we know it: surely he [the Tanna] states the reason, viz., 'BESIDE THE BURNT-OFFERING OF THE MORNING'? — Perhaps only the daily-offerings precede the additional offerings, because they are constant; how do we know that additional-offerings [precede] [less frequent] additional-offerings?⁵ —

Said R. Elai, Because Scripture states, Like these ye shall offer daily, for seven days:⁶ [instead of] 'these', 'like these' [is written].⁷ But this is required for its own purpose?⁸ — If so,⁹ let [Scripture] write, 'These ye shall offer daily'.¹⁰ If it wrote, 'These ye shall offer daily for seven days', I would think [that] these [are offered] in the seven days?¹¹ — 'Daily' is written.¹² Yet I might still interpret. These [ye shall offer] for the day,¹³ but on the remaining days I could not know how many?¹⁴ — Scripture says, Ye shall offer, [which implies] that all your offerings must be alike.¹⁵ Abaye said: [We learn it] from that very text.¹⁶ For if so,¹⁷ let Scripture say 'beside the burnt-offering of the morning', and then be silent; why state, which is for a continual burnt-offering? To teach that that which is more constant takes precedence.¹⁸

Zevachim 89a

CHAPTER X

MISHNAH. WHATEVER IS MORE CONSTANT THAN ANOTHER TAKES PRECEDENCE OVER THE OTHER. THE DAILY OFFERINGS;¹ PRECEDE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS;² THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS OF THE SABBATH PRECEDE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS OF NEW MOON;³ THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS OF NEW MOON PRECEDE THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS OF NEW YEAR; FOR IT IS SAID, [YE SHALL OFFER THESE] BESIDE THE BURNT-OFFERING OF THE MORNING, WHICH IS FOR A CONTINUAL BURNT-OFFERING.⁴

MISHNAH. WHATEVER IS MORE SACRED THAN ANOTHER PRECEDES THAT OTHER. THE BLOOD OF A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES THE BLOOD OF A BURNT-OFFERING,¹⁹ BECAUSE IT PROPITIATES.²⁰ THE LIMBS OF A BURNT-OFFERING PRECEDE THE EMURIM OF A SIN-OFFERING,²¹ BECAUSE IT [THE FORMER] IS ENTIRELY FOR [ALTAR] FIRES. A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES A GUILT-OFFERING, BECAUSE ITS BLOOD IS SPRINKLED ON THE FOUR HORNS AND ON THE BASE.²²

A GUILT-OFFERING PRECEDES A THANKSOFFERING AND A NAZIRITE'S RAM, BECAUSE IT IS A SACRIFICE OF HIGHER SANCTITY. A THANKSOFFERING AND A NAZIRITE'S RAM PRECEDE A PEACE-

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

OFFERING, BECAUSE THEY ARE EATEN ONE DAY [ONLY] AND REQUIRE [THE ACCOMPANIMENT OF] LOAVES. A PEACE-OFFERING PRECEDES A FIRSTLING, BECAUSE IT REQUIRES FOUR [BLOOD] APPLICATIONS, LAYING [OF HANDS]. DRINK-OFFERINGS, AND THE WAVING OF THE BREAST AND THE THIGH.

A FIRSTLING PRECEDES TITHE, BECAUSE ITS SANCTITY IS FROM THE WOMB,²³ AND IT IS EATEN BY PRIESTS. TITHE PRECEDES BIRD[-OFFERINGS]. BECAUSE IT IS A SLAUGHTERED SACRIFICE,²⁴ AND PART OF IT IS MOST SACRED, [VIZ.,] ITS BLOOD AND EMURIM.²⁵ BIRDS PRECEDE MEAL-OFFERINGS, BECAUSE THEY ARE BLOOD SACRIFICES. A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING PRECEDES A VOTIVE MEAL-OFFERING, BECAUSE IT COMES ON ACCOUNT OF SIN. A SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD PRECEDES A BURNT-OFFERING OF A BIRD; AND IT IS LIKEWISE WHEN HE DEDICATES THEM.²⁶

- (1) Lit., 'continual' offerings — the daily burnt-offerings.
- (2) Which were sacrificed on Sabbaths, Festivals, and New Moons.
- (3) When the Sabbath and New Moon concurred, similarly the other cases.
- (4) Num. XXVIII, 23. 'These' are the additional festival offerings, whilst 'beside the burnt-offering of the morning' implies that that had already been offered, having preceded the additional offerings.
- (5) Since even the more frequent additional offerings are not really constant, perhaps we disregard their greater frequency.
- (6) Ibid. 24.
- (7) He interprets: like those which are mentioned in the preceding verse: as in those the more frequent take precedence, so in these (the festival additional-offerings) the more frequent take precedence.
- (8) To teach that an additional offering must be brought every day of the festival.
- (9) If that is its only purpose.
- (10) Not 'like these.'
- (11) I.e., the seven he-lambs specified in Num. XXVIII, 19 are not offered each day but spread over the seven days.
- (12) Which precludes that interpretation.
- (13) Sc. the first day.
- (14) If Scripture did not write, like these.

(15) The offerings on each day (including the first) must be the same. Hence 'like' is unnecessary for that purpose, and so intimates precedence.

(16) Cited in the Mishnah.

(17) If its teaching applies only to the daily offerings.

(18) In all cases. For that reason 'continual' is emphasized.

(19) If both are ready for sprinkling at the same time.

(20) It makes atonement where kareth is involved.

(21) For burning.

(22) Whereas of the guilt-offering only two applications are made, and not on the horns; nor is the blood poured out on the base (Rashi).

(23) It is born sacred.

(24) Whereas a bird requires melikah; slaughtering is considered higher.

(25) Even in lesser sacrifices these possess the same sanctity as the most sacred sacrifices, since they belong to the altar. In the case of a bird only the blood possesses that sanctity, but there are no emurim.

(26) When a man dedicates the two birds (v Lev. V, 7) he first dedicates the one for sin-offering and then the one for burnt-offering.

Zevachim 89b

GEMARA. How do we know these things? — Because our Rabbis taught: And a second young bullock thou shalt take for a sin-offering;¹ Now, if this comes to teach that there are two [sacrifices], surely it has already been said, And offer thou the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering.² What then is taught by, And a second young bullock thou shalt take for a sin-offering? For one might think that a sin-offering takes precedence over all the rites of a burnt-offering,³ therefore it says. And a second young bullock thou shalt take for a sin-offering.⁴ If [we had only the text] And a second young bullock [to go by], you might think that a burnt-offering precedes a sin-offering in all its rites: therefore it says, And offer thou the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering. How are these [to be reconciled]? The blood of a sin-offering takes precedence over the blood of a burnt-offering [in sprinkling], because it propitiates.⁵

ZEVUCHIM – 57a-91a

THE LIMBS OF A BURNT-OFFERING, etc. Yet why so? say that [only] the first application [of the blood of the sin-offering], which makes atonement, takes precedence, but not the rest?⁶ — Said Rabina: Here we are treating of the Levites' sin-offering, and though it was like a burnt-offering,⁷ the Divine Law ordered it to take precedence.⁸ In the West [Palestine] they said: Since he commenced the applications [of the sin-offering], he completes [them]. It was asked: Regarding the blood of a sin-offering and the limbs of a burnt-offering, which of them takes precedence? Does the blood of a sin-offering take precedence, because it propitiates; or perhaps the limbs of a burnt-offering take precedence, because they are entirely [destined] for [altar] fires? —

Come and hear: THE BLOOD OF A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES THE BLOOD OF A BURNT-OFFERING; thus only the blood of a burnt-offering does it precede, but it does not precede the limbs of a burnt-offering. On the contrary, [infer] from the subsequent clause: THE LIMBS OF A BURNT-OFFERING PRECEDE THE EMURIM OF A SIN-OFFERING: thus only the emurim of a sin-offering do they precede, but they do not precede the blood of a sin-offering. Rather, no inference can be made from this. It was asked: [As to] the blood of a burnt-offering and the emurim of a sin-offering, which of these takes precedence? Does the blood of a burnt-offering take precedence, because it comes in virtue of a sacrifice that is altogether burnt; or perhaps the emurim of a sin-offering take precedence, because they come in virtue of an atoning [sacrifice]?—

Come and hear: THE BLOOD OF A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES THE BLOOD OF A BURNT-OFFERING; thus, only the blood of a sin-offering precedes the blood of a burnt-offering, but the emurim of a sin-offering do not. On the contrary, [infer] from the

subsequent clause: THE LIMBS OF A BURNT-OFFERING PRECEDE THE EMURIM OF A SIN-OFFERING: thus, only the limbs of a burnt-offering precede the emurim of a sin-offering, but the blood of a burnt-offering does not. Rather, no inference can be made from this. It was asked: [As to] the blood of a burnt-offering and the blood of a guilt-offering, which takes precedence? Does the blood of a burnt-offering precede, because it comes in virtue of a sacrifice that is altogether burnt; or perhaps the blood of a guilt-offering precedes, because it makes atonement? —

Come and hear: THE BLOOD OF A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES THE BLOOD OF A BURNT-OFFERING; hence the blood of a guilt-offering does not. [No:] by right he [the Tanna] should have taught the blood of a guilt-offering [too], but because he wishes to teach in a later clause: THE LIMBS OF A BURNT-OFFERING PRECEDE THE EMURIM OF A SIN-OFFERING; for if he taught [that they precede] the emurim of a guilt-offering, I would argue: only the emurim of a guilt-offering do they precede, but they do not precede the emurim of a sin-offering;⁹ for that reason he teaches about a sin-offering [only].

Come and hear: A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES A GUILT-OFFERING; thus, only a sin-offering precedes a guilt-offering, but a burnt-offering does not. Surely that refers to the blood? — No: it refers to the emurim. This may be proved too, for he teaches BECAUSE ITS BLOOD IS APPLIED, [and does not teach, Because it is applied].¹⁰ This proves it.

A SIN-OFFERING PRECEDES, etc. On the contrary, a guilt-offering should precede, because it has a fixed value?¹¹ — Even so, the greater number of altar [rites] is more important.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

A GUILT-OFFERING PRECEDES A THANKSOFFERING, etc. On the contrary, a thanks-offering and a Nazirite's ram should take precedence, since they require loaves? — Even so, sacrifices of higher sanctity are more important.

A THANKSOFFERING AND A NAZIRITE'S RAM, etc. On the contrary, a peace-offering should take precedence, since it is congregational as well as private?¹² — Even so [the fact that] they are eaten for one day only is more weighty. It was asked: [As to] a thanks-offering and a Nazirite's ram, which of these takes precedence? Does a thanks-offering take precedence, because it requires [the accompaniment of] four kinds of loaves;¹³ or perhaps a Nazirite's ram takes precedence, because other sacrifices¹⁴ accompany it?¹⁵ —

Come and hear: This one precedes the other,¹⁶ because the former requires four kinds of loaves, whereas the latter requires only two kinds of loaves.¹⁷

A PEACE-OFFERING PRECEDES A FIRSTLING, etc. On the contrary, a firstling should take precedence, since its sanctity is from the womb and it is eaten by priests [only]? — Even so, the greater number of rites [connected with a peace-offering] are more important.

A FIRSTLING PRECEDES, etc. On the contrary, tithe should take precedence, since it sanctifies what precedes it and what follows it?¹⁸ Even so, sanctity from the womb is weightier.

TITHE PRECEDES BIRD-OFFERINGS, etc. On the contrary, bird-offerings should take precedence, since they are most sacred? — Even so, the species of slaughtering is more important. Rabina b. Shila said: If the emurim of lesser sacrifices are taken out¹⁹ before the sprinkling of the blood, they are disqualified. Now, our Tanna supports this:

BECAUSE IT IS A SLAUGHTERED SACRIFICE, AND PART OF IT IS MOST SACRED, [VIZ.,] ITS BLOOD AND EMURIM. As for emurim, it is well, [as] these are absent in birds; but blood at all events is present?²⁰ Surely then he informs us this: emurim are like blood: just as blood [is most holy] before sprinkling, so are emurim [most holy only] before sprinkling, and [only then] are they designated most sacred; and as blood is disqualified through being taken out, so are emurim disqualified through going out. Shall we say that the following supports him: If the flesh of lesser sacrifices was taken out before the sprinkling of the blood, R. Johanan says: It is fit; Resh Lakish maintains: It is disqualified. R. Johanan says [that] it is fit, since it must eventually be carried out [in any case].²¹ Resh Lakish maintains [that] it is disqualified: it was not yet time for it to be carried out. Thus, they disagree only in respect of flesh, but not in respect of emurim!²² — [No:] in fact they disagree in respect of emurim too, but the reason that they disagree [explicitly] about flesh is to inform you how far Resh Lakish maintains his view,²³ that even flesh, which will eventually be carried out, he maintains that it was not yet time for it to be carried out. Shall we say that it is dependent on Tannaim: [With regard to] emurim of lesser sacrifices which were taken out before sprinkling: R. Eliezer maintains: They do not involve trespass,²⁴

(1) Num. VIII, 8. This treats of the consecration of the Levites.

(2) Ibid. 12. He speaks of it as 'already said' although it comes later.

(3) As is implied in v. 13, where sin-offering is mentioned first.

(4) Which intimates that it is second to the burnt-offering in the performance of its rites.

(5) Whilst the limbs of the burnt-offering are burnt before the emurim of a sin-offering.

(6) For atonement is made with a single application, supra 38a.

(7) Since it was not on account of sin at all.

(8) Hence its precedence does not cease when atonement has been made, since here there was no atonement.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(9) Since a sin-offering is more sacred than a guilt-offering.

(10) If by SIN-OFFERING he meant the blood, he should say, because it is applied. Emended text.

(11) Not less than two shekels; v. Lev. V, 15: a ram... according to thy valuation in silver by shekels... for a guilt-offering. Shekels implies at least two, whereas a sin-offering may be of any value.

(12) Congregational (public) peace-offerings were offered on the Feast of Weeks, v. Lev. XXIII, 19, whereas these others were private sacrifices only.

(13) V. Lev. VII, 12f.

(14) Lit., 'blood'.

(15) Sc. a sin-offering and a burnt-offering.

(16) Sc. the thanks-offering precedes the Nazirite's ram.

(17) V. Num. VI, 15.

(18) If a man counts his cattle in order to tithe them, and declares the ninth and eleventh each as the tenth, in addition to the real tenth, they are all sanctified.

(19) Of the Temple court.

(20) Hence blood should not be mentioned, since in this respect birds are the same.

(21) As it is eaten anywhere in Jerusalem.

(22) Presumably R. Johanan too agrees that these are disqualified.

(23) Lit., 'to inform you the strength of Resh Lakish'.

(24) V. p. 405, n. 8. — This is even after sprinkling, because sprinkling is now of no avail to make them subject to trespass.

what went out. But surely it was R. Papa who said:⁸ If they are still without, none disagree;⁹ they disagree only where they were taken in again? — That is only in connection with the Two Loaves, which are not part of the sacrifice itself; but since emurim are part of the sacrifice itself, they disagree where they are still without.

BIRD-OFFERINGS PRECEDE, etc. On the contrary, meal-offerings should take precedence, since they are both congregational and private?¹⁰ — Even so, the fact that they are blood sacrifices outweighs this.

A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING, etc. On the contrary, a votive meal-offering should take precedence, since it requires oil and frankincense? — Even so, a sinner's meal-offering, which is brought on account of sin, is more important, since it makes atonement. It was asked: [As to] the meal-offering of a sotah¹¹ and a votive meal-offering, which of these takes precedence? Does a votive meal-offering take precedence, because it requires oil and frankincense; or perhaps a Sotah's meal-offering takes precedence, because it is brought to investigate sin? —

Zevachim 90a

and one is not culpable on their account in respect of piggul,¹ nothar,² or uncleanness.³ R. Akiba maintains: They involve trespass, and one is culpable on their account for Piggul, nothar, and defilement. Surely they disagree where they were taken in again,⁴ and they disagree in this: one master [R. Eliezer] holds that they were disqualified by having been taken out, while another master holds that they were not disqualified by being taken out? —

Said R. Papa: If they were taken in again, none disagree;⁵ but here they disagree where they are still without,⁶ and they disagree in this: one master holds [that] sprinkling is not effective for what is without,⁷ while the other master holds [that] sprinkling is effective for

Come and hear: **A SINNER'S MEAL-OFFERING PRECEDES A VOTIVE MEAL-OFFERING**: thus, only a sinner's meal-offering precedes a votive meal-offering, but a Sotah's meal-offering does not! — [No:] does he then teach, because it makes atonement; [surely] he teaches, **BECAUSE IT COMES ON ACCOUNT OF SIN**, and this one [a Sotah's meal-offering] too comes on account of sin.

Come and hear: This one precedes that one, because the former is of wheat, while the latter is of barley.¹³ Surely that means, a votive meal-offering [precedes] a Sotah's meal-offering? — No: [it means that] a sinner's meal-offering [precedes] a Sotah's meal-offering. Then infer it from the fact that

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

the former makes atonement while the latter does not make atonement?¹⁴ — What then: [it refers to] a votive meal-offering? Then infer it from the fact that the one [a votive meal-offering] requires oil and frankincense, while the other does not require oil and frankincense? Rather, he states one of two reasons.¹⁵

A SIN-OFFERING OF A BIRD PRECEDES, etc. Whence do we know it? — For our Rabbis taught: And he shall offer that which is for the sin-offering first;¹⁶ for what purpose is this stated? If to teach that it comes before the burnt-offering, surely it is already said, And he shall prepare the second for a burnt-offering?¹⁷ This, however, furnishes a general rule for all sin-offerings, that they take precedence over all burnt-offerings which accompany them, [sc.] the bird sin-offering [precedes] the bird burnt-offering, the animal sin-offering [precedes] the animal burnt-offering, and even a bird sin-offering [precedes] an animal burnt-offering.¹⁸ Therefore, [that] a bird sin-offering [precedes] a bird burnt-offering [is inferred from], And he shall prepare the second for a burnt-offering. An animal sin-offering [precedes] an animal burnt-offering, because the Divine Law intimated an extension;¹⁹ a bird sin-offering [precedes] an animal burnt-offering, because this is a general rule.²⁰

Come and hear: R. Eliezer said: Wherever a sin-offering is exchanged, the sin-offering [of a bird] takes precedence,²¹ but here²² the burnt-offering [of a bird] takes precedence.²³ Wherever it comes on account of sin, the sin-offering takes precedence; but here the burnt-offering takes precedence.²⁴

Wherever both [birds] come instead of one sin-offering, the sin-offering takes precedence; but here that they do not both come on account of one sin-offering,²⁵ the burnt-offering takes precedence?²⁶ — Said Raba: Scripture accorded it precedence in respect of designating it.²⁷

Come and hear: Bulls take precedence over rams, rams take precedence over lambs, lambs over he-goats.

(1) Because they are as though blood had not been sprinkled for them, and so all their mattirin (q.v. Glos. and supra 29b, 43a) had not been presented.

(2) Because nothar applies only to what may be eaten within the prescribed period; this, however, may not.

(3) I.e., if an unclean person eats them, he is not liable. For only what is permitted to clean persons involves liability on account of personal defilement, but what is not so permitted does not involve liability. Now emurim (which are burnt on the altar, and so not permitted even to clean persons) are nevertheless included, as is deduced by Scriptural exegesis, but only on a similar basis to flesh: as flesh involves culpability only after sprinkling, so the emurim. Sprinkling, however, is ineffective in respect of these emurim, and therefore they do not involve culpability.

(4) Before sprinkling, yet even then R. Eliezer maintains that sprinkling is of no avail, because taking them out had disqualified them.

(5) Sprinkling is certainly effective.

(6) At the time of sprinkling.

(7) Lit., 'for what went out' — and is still outside.

(8) In connection with the two loaves which were brought on Pentecost, if they were taken out of the Temple court between the slaughtering of the accompanying sacrifice and the sprinkling of its blood.

(9) Sprinkling is certainly of no avail.

(10) Sc. the meal-offerings which accompanied the 'omer (sheaf of corn) and the Two Loaves; these were congregational (v. Lev. XXIII, 10-21). There were no public offerings of birds.

(11) A wife suspected of adultery, v. Num. V, 12-15.

(12) Lit., 'comes from'.

(13) Wheat is superior to barley.

(14) Instead of because one is of wheat while the other is of barley.

(15) This answer must be given whatever you relate it to, and therefore it may well refer to a votive meal-offering and a sinner's meal-offering.

(16) Lev. V, 8.

(17) Ibid. 10.

(18) E.g. a woman after childbirth, who brings a year-old lamb for a burnt-offering, and a pigeon or a turtle-dove for a sin-offering.

(19) By the additional text.

(20) I.e., the law thus established applies to all sin-offerings and burnt-offerings.

(21) Where an animal sin-offering is prescribed in the first place, but Scripture permits it, when one

ZEVACHIM – 57a-91a

is poor, to be exchanged for two birds of which one is for a sin-offering and one for a burnt-offering (e.g. when an unclean person enters the sanctuary, v. Lev. V, 1 seq.) the bird sin-offering takes precedence over the bird burnt-offering.

(22) In the case of a woman after childbirth to whom 'here' refers in the whole passage.

(23) Because she is liable to an animal burnt-offering, and in poverty she may bring two birds, one for a burnt-offering and another for a sin-offering, v. Lev. XII, 1 seq.

(24) As even the sin-offering is not on account of sin.

(25) In poverty she substitutes a bird burnt-offering for an animal burnt-offering, as a bird sin-offering was brought in any case, v. *ibid.* 6-8.

(26) This contradicts the Mishnah which teaches that a bird sin-offering takes precedence over an animal burnt-offering, whereas here she brings the animal burnt-offering before the bird sin-offering.

(27) One must first designate (i.e. dedicate) the animal (or bird) for the burnt-offering and then the bird for the sin-offering. But the latter is sacrificed first.

Zevachim 90b

Does that not refer to those of the Festival?¹
— No: [it means those] of a votive offering;² bullocks precede rams, because their drink-offerings are larger;³ and for the same reason rams [precede] lambs; [while] lambs [precede] he-goats because more [is offered] of them, [viz.,] the fat-tail.⁴

Come and hear: The bullock of the anointed priest precedes the congregation's bullock for inadvertent sin; the congregation's bullock for inadvertent sin precedes the bullock for idolatry; the bullock of idolatry precedes the he-goats of idolatry. [And this is so] notwithstanding that the bullock of idolatry is a burnt-offering, whereas the he-goats of idolatry are sin-offerings? But why not deduce from the first clause: the congregation's bullock for inadvertent sin precedes the bullock of idolatry?⁵ — We do not speak [of where both sacrifices are] of one kind: there a sin-offering [certainly] takes precedence. We speak of two kinds,⁶ and yet here we find a burnt-offering preceding a sin-offering? —

In the West [Palestine] they said in Raba b. Mari's name: The sin-offering of idolatry lacks an alef, as *le-hattath* is written.⁷ Rabina said: In their cases 'according to the ordinance' is written.⁸ Now that you have come to this, you may even say that [the preceding passage refers to] the bullocks of the Festival, [for] 'after their ordinance' is written in connection with them too.¹⁰

It was asked: [With regard to] a bird sin-offering, an animal burnt-offering, and tithe, which of these precede?¹¹ Shall the bird sin-offering come first? there is tithe, which must precede it! Shall tithe come first? there is the animal burnt-offering, which must precede it! Shall the animal burnt-offering come first? there is the bird sin-offering, which must precede it! — Here¹² they held that a slaughtered sacrifice is more important.¹³ In the West they said: The superiority of an animal burnt-offering [over tithe] serves the bird sin-offering and advances it over that of tithe.¹⁴

MISHNAH. ALL SIN-OFFERINGS IN THE TORAH PRECEDE GUILT-OFFERINGS,¹⁵ EXCEPT A LEPER'S GUILT-OFFERING, BECAUSE IT COMES TO MAKE [A PERSON] FIT.¹⁶ ALL GUILT-OFFERINGS OF THE TORAH MUST BE¹⁷ TWO-YEAR OLDS AND [TWO] SILVER SHEKELS IN VALUE,¹⁸ EXCEPT A NAZIRITES GUILT-OFFERING AND A LEPER'S GUILT-OFFERING: THESE MUST BE A YEAR OLD, AND NEED NOT BE [TWO] SILVER SHEKELS IN VALUE.¹⁹ AS THEY TAKE PRECEDENCE IN BEING OFFERED, SO THEY TAKE PRECEDENCE IN BEING EATEN.²⁰ IN THE CASE OF A PEACE-OFFERING OF YESTERDAY AND A PEACE-OFFERING OF TO-DAY,²¹ THAT OF YESTERDAY TAKES PRECEDENCE. IN THE CASE OF A PEACE-OFFERING OF YESTERDAY AND A SIN-OFFERING AND A GUILT-OFFERING OF TO-DAY, YESTERDAY'S PEACE-OFFERING TAKES PRECEDENCE: THAT IS R. MEIR'S RULING.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

BUT THE SAGES MAINTAIN: THE SIN-OFFERING TAKES PRECEDENCE, BECAUSE IT IS A MOST SACRED SACRIFICE. AND IN ALL OF THESE, THE PRIESTS MAY DEVIATE IN THEIR MODE OF EATING, AND EAT THEM ROAST, STEWED OR BOILED, AND SEASON THEM WITH CONDIMENTS OF HULLIN OR OF TERUMAH: SO SAID R. SIMEON. R. MEIR SAID: ONE MAY NOT SEASON THEM WITH CONDIMENTS OF TERUMAH, SO AS NOT TO BRING TERUMAH TO UNFITNESS.²²

GEMARA. It was asked: That which is more constant and that which is more sacred,²³ which takes precedence? Does that which is more constant take precedence, because it is more constant; or does that which is more sacred take precedence, because it is more sacred? —

Come and hear: The continual [burnt-]offerings precede the additional offerings.

- (1) Sc. Tabernacles; the he-goats were sin-offerings and the lambs were burnt-offerings, yet the lambs take precedence.
- (2) And both are burnt-offerings.
- (3) A bullock requires a drink-offering of three 'esronim (pl. of 'issaron, a tenth part of an ephah), a ram one of two, and a lamb one 'issaron.
- (4) Which in the case of a lamb is burnt on the altar as emurim, but not in the case of a he-goat; cf. Lev. III, 6-10 with 12-15. Though this passage refers to burnt-offerings, which are entirely burnt on the altar, yet the reason is valid, because it holds good of sacrifices in general.
- (5) Instead of raising a difficulty from the final clause, cite the first clause to corroborate the Mishnah.
- (6) Which is what the above-stated principle sets out to establish, that a bird sin-offering takes precedence over an animal burnt-offering.
- (7) Heb. להטת instead of להטאת Num. XV, 24. This teaches that it is an exception and does not precede the burnt-offering.
- (8) Sc. the offerings for idolatry.
- (9) Ibid. This implies that they must be offered in the same order as they are prescribed, and the burnt-offering is mentioned there first.
- (10) Ibid. XXIX, 33. There too the burnt-offerings are mentioned first. But in all other cases the sin-offering, even if it is only a bird, precedes.
- (11) When we have the three together.

(12) In Babylon.

(13) Therefore tithe comes first, then the bird sin-offering and then the animal burnt-offering. The animal burnt-offering cannot come first, since Scripture expressly stated that it follows the sin-offering.

(14) Since the burnt-offering accompanies the sin-offering, the higher importance of the former over tithe, viz., that it is a most sacred sacrifice and is altogether burnt, invests the sin-offering with the same superiority over tithe. Hence the sin-offering must be sacrificed first, then the burnt-offering, and last of all tithe.

(15) Where a person was liable to both and brought them at the same time.

(16) To enter the Temple and partake of sacrifices. This invests it with greater importance.

(17) Lit., 'come'.

(18) According to thy valuation in silver by shekels (Lev. V, 15), denoting at least two, is written in connection with the guilt-offering for trespass; other guilt-offerings are inferred from it, v. supra 48a.

(19) For both a year-old animal is prescribed (Num. VI, 12; v. Lev. XIV, 10-12). Again, since Scripture decreed that the two-year old ram for the guilt-offerings must be worth two silver shekels, a year-old lamb would be worth less.

(20) This refers to all sacrifices, those enumerated in the preceding Mishnah too.

(21) I.e., the former animal was brought yesterday, but has not yet been offered. Or, one sacrificed yesterday and one to-day, but neither has yet been eaten.

(22) For should they become nothar, the condiments too might not be eaten, even if they could be separated from the flesh, because they absorbed the taste of that flesh, which is now forbidden.

(23) E.g. if we have the blood of the daily burnt-offering and that of a sin-offering for sprinkling: the daily burnt-offering is more constant, while the sin-offering is more sacred.

Zevachim 91a

[Now this is so] notwithstanding that the additional offerings are more sacred!¹ — [No:] does then the Sabbath affect the additional offerings and not affect the continual-offerings?²

Come and hear: The additional-offerings of the Sabbath precede the additional-offerings

ZEVUCHIM – 57a-91a

of New Moon! — Does then New Moon affect its own additional offerings and not affect the additional offerings of the Sabbath?

Come and hear: The additional offerings of New Moon precede the additional offerings of New Year, although New Year is holier! — Does then New Year affect its own additional offerings and not affect the additional offerings of New Moon?

Come and hear: Another reason: the blessing for wine is constant, while the blessing for the day is not constant, and of that which is constant and that which is not constant, that which is constant comes first.³ [Now this is so] notwithstanding that the blessing for the day is holier!⁴ — Does then the Sabbath affect the blessing for the day and not affect the blessing for the wine?⁵

Come and hear, for R. Johanan said: The halachah is that one must recite the minhah [afternoon] service and then recite the additional service.⁶ [Although the additional service is more sacred!]⁷ — Does then the Sabbath affect the additional service and not affect the minhah service?

Come and hear: IN THE CASE OF A PEACE-OFFERING OF YESTERDAY, AND A SIN-OFFERING AND A GUILT-OFFERING OF TO-DAY, YESTERDAY'S PEACE-OFFERING TAKES PRECEDENCE. Hence, if both are of to-day, the sin-offering and the guilt-offering take precedence, although a peace-offering is more constant!⁸ — Said Raba: You speak of what is common: we ask about what is constant, not about what is more common.⁹ Said R. Huna b. Judah to Raba: Is then what is common not [the same as what is] constant?¹⁰ Surely it was taught: I would exclude the Passover-offering, which is not constant, but I would not exclude circumcision, which is constant!¹¹ — What does 'constant' mean? It is more constant in precepts.¹² Alternatively, circumcision is constant in comparison with the Passover-

offering.¹³ It was asked: [If one thing is] constant and [another] non-constant, and [the priest] slaughtered the non-constant first, what is the law?¹⁴ Do we say, since he slaughtered it, he must offer [i.e., sprinkle] it [first]; or perhaps he must give it to another to stir the blood until he offers the constant, and then offer the non-constant?¹⁵ — Said R. Huna¹⁶ of Sura,¹⁷

Come and hear: IN THE CASE OF A PEACE-OFFERING OF YESTERDAY, AND A SIN-OFFERING AND A GUILT-OFFERING OF TO-DAY, YESTERDAY'S PEACE-OFFERING TAKES PRECEDENCE. Hence if it were [a peace-offering] of to-day analogous to that of yesterday — and how could that be? if he slaughtered the peace-offering first — [the sprinkling of] the sin-offering and the guilt-offering would take precedence!¹⁸ — [No:] perhaps how [is the case of] a peace-offering of yesterday and a sin-offering and a guilt-offering of to-day meant? Where he slaughtered both.¹⁹ Where, however, he did not slaughter both, there you have the question.

Come and hear: Another reason: the blessing for the wine is constant, whereas the blessing for the day is not constant, and of that which is constant and that which is not constant, that which is constant comes first!²⁰ — Here too, since it [the wine] has arrived,²¹ it is analogous to both having been slaughtered.

Come and hear, for R. Johanan said: The halachah is that one must recite the minhah [afternoon] service and then recite the additional service!²² — Here too, since the time for the minhah service has come, it is as though they were both slaughtered.

R. Aha the son of R. Ashi said to Rabina: Come and hear:²³ If he killed it²⁴ before midday, it is disqualified, because 'at dusk' is said in connection with it.²⁵ [If he killed it] before the [evening] Tamid, it is fit, and one must stir its blood until he sprinkles the blood

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

of the tamid!²⁶ — The case we discuss here is where e.g. he first slaughtered the tamid.²⁷ Said R. Aha the elder to R. Ashi: The Mishnah too proves that, because it teaches, ‘until he sprinkles the blood of the Tamid,’ but it does not teach, until he slaughters [the Tamid] and sprinkles its blood. This proves it.

AND IN ALL OF THESE, THE PRIESTS MAY DEVIATE, etc. What is the reason? — Scripture says, [Even all the hallowed things... unto thee have I given them] for a consecrated portion,²⁸ which means, as [a symbol of] greatness [so that they can be eaten] just as kings eat.²⁹

MISHNAH. R. SIMEON SAID: IF YOU SEE OIL BEING SHARED OUT IN THE TEMPLE COURT,³⁰ YOU NEED NOT ASK WHAT IT IS, FOR IT IS THE RESIDUE OF THE WAFERS [REKIKIM] OF THE ISRAELITE'S MEAL-OFFERINGS³¹, OR OF THE LEPER'S LOG OF OIL.³² IF YOU SEE OIL BEING POURED ON TO THE FIRES,³³ YOU NEED NOT ASK WHAT IT IS, FOR IT IS THE RESIDUE OF THE OIL OF THE WAFERS OF PRIESTS' MEAL-OFFERINGS, OR OF THE ANOINTED PRIEST'S MEAL-OFFERING; FOR MEN CANNOT OFFER OIL [ALONE].³⁴ R. TARFON SAID: OIL CAN BE DONATED [BY ITSELF].

(1) For they are brought on Sabbath and Festivals, whereas continual offerings are brought on week-days too.

(2) Just as it invests the former with greater sanctity, so it invests the latter too, seeing that we are now treating of the continual offering brought on the Sabbath.

(3) This explains why in Kiddush (Sanctification Benediction, recited at the beginning of every festival) the blessing over wine precedes that over the festival! — Whenever wine is drunk a blessing over it is required, whereas the blessing of sanctification is confined to festivals.

(4) Since the other is recited on week-days too.

(5) The sanctity of the latter too is enhanced when it is recited on the Sabbath or festival.

(6) V. supra 12a.

(7) Bracketed passage added by Sh.M.

(8) They are more common, since they can be brought at any time, whereas a sin-offering and a

guilt-offering can be brought only when one is liable to them.

(9) A peace-offering is not legally more constant than a sin-offering, since one is not obliged to vow a peace-offering.

(10) Is not a thing regarded as more constant when it is more common?

(11) It is a general rule that one incurs a sin-offering for an inadvertent transgression which if committed deliberately would involve kareth. This however refers to negative injunctions (hence, sins of commission), not to positive commands; therefore, though deliberate neglect of the Passover-offering or circumcision involves kareth, unintentional neglect does not involve a sin-offering. In the present passage, however, it is sought to draw a distinction between the Passover-offering and circumcision, on the grounds that the latter is constant. Now actually it is no more constant than the former, since both are obligatory, and it is only more common (since circumcision takes place at any time, while the Passover-offering is sacrificed only for Passover), and yet it is called constant, which shows that the two are identical.

(12) It is more emphasized in Scripture, the word ‘covenant’ occurring thirteen times in connection with it.

(13) For the reason stated in n. 6. But a peace-offering is not so much more common than a sin- or a guilt-offering to rank as constant in comparison with it.

(14) Whose blood must be sprinkled first?

(15) The blood would have to be stirred to keep it from congealing.

(16) Sh.M. reads: R. Hanina.

(17) The great academy town on the river Sura, a branch of the Euphrates; v. Obermeyer Landschaft, pp. 283-287.

(18) R. Huna understands the Mishnah thus: If a peace-offering was brought yesterday but only killed to-day, while a sin-offering or a guilt-offering brought to-day is still waiting to be slaughtered, the blood of the peace-offering must be sprinkled before the other is slaughtered. For he holds that if the peace-offering too has yet to be slaughtered, the Mishnah would not rule that it takes precedence. Hence by inference, if both were brought to-day and the peace-offering was wrongly slaughtered first, the slaughtering of the sin-offering, etc. must precede the sprinkling of the peace-offering. This proves that where one sacrifice is more sacred than another, and the latter was slaughtered first, the former must nevertheless be slaughtered, and its blood sprinkled, before that of the less sacred is sprinkled, and presumably the same applies where one sacrifice is more constant than the other.

ZEVOCHIM – 57a-91a

(19) Though he wrongly slaughtered the peace-offering first, yet since it is yesterday's, he must sprinkle its blood first too. From this you could infer that if both were of to-day, he must sprinkle the blood of the sin-offering first.

(20) Although the non-constant actually preceded the other, since the sanctity of the day automatically commenced at nightfall. This is analogous to slaughtering the non-constant first; and as here the blessing for the wine must be recited first, by analogy the blood of the constant must be sprinkled first.

(21) We have the wine actually before us.

(22) Although the time for the additional service came first; v. p. 435, n. 6: the argument here is similar.

(23) Emended text (Sh.M.).

(24) The Passover-offering.

(25) Ex. XII, 6: And the whole assembly... shall kill it at dusk; lit., 'between the evenings'.

(26) This proves that when one sacrifice is sacrificed earlier than it should be, the sprinkling must nevertheless wait.

(27) Before sprinkling the blood of the Passover-offering.

(28) Num. XVIII, 8.

(29) Hence they can eat it as they like. Cf. supra 28a.

(30) To the priests, for food.

(31) V. Lev. II, 4. The oil was used in smearing the wafers.

(32) V. Ibid., XIV, 12 seq.

(33) I.e., being burnt on the altar. The 'fires' (Heb. Ishim, pl. of Isheh, generally rendered, 'an offering made by fire') are those of sacrifices or portions thereof (sc. the emurim) as they are burnt on the altar.

(34) Hence this oil must be the residue of oil used in a meal-offering.